DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 782 CS 508 294

AUTHOR	Zappen, James P., Ed.; Katz, Susan, Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication (18th, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 10-12, 1991).
INSTITUTION	Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication.
PUB DATE	Oct 91
NOTE	156p.; For other editions of these proceedings, see CS 508 288-295 and ED 252 864-872.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accreditation (Institutions); *Advisory Committees; Case Studies; College Faculty; Higher Education; Models; Peer Evaluation; Program Descriptions; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Rhetoric; *Technical Writing
IDENTIFIERS	Professional Writing

ABSTRACT

Based on the theme of issues, questions, and controversies in program development and review, this proceedings presents papers delivered at the annual meeting of the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication (CPTSC). Papers in the proceedings are divided into four sections: Benchmarks for Quality: Developing Criteria for Review; Walking the Tightrope: Balancing the Concerns of Industry and Academia; Views from the Trenches: Case Studies in Progress; and Review, Certification, Accreditation--Is It Time to Decide? Papers in the proceedings are: "Program Development: How Do You Keep Up with the Technology?" (Martha C. Sammons); "The Place of Rhetoric in the Technical Communication Program" (Carolyn D. Rude); "The Need for a Model Program Guide" (Chuck Nelson); "Who Are the Faculty of the CPTSC?" (Maria Curro Kreppel); "Developing Criteria for Review: What Manuscript Referees Have to Say" (Mary M. Lay); "Program Development and Workplace Realities" (Stephen A. Bernhardt); "The 'Is/Ought' Tension in Technical and Scientific Communication Program Development" (Bob Johnson); "New Mexico Tech's Technical Communication Program: Introducing a Corporate Board" (Lynn Deming); "Articulating Goals for a University/Corporate Advisory Board" (Deborah S. Bosley); "Benefits of a Review and Rating System" (Chris Velotta); "Assessing Program Self-Assessment: A View from the Trenches" (Carol S. Lipson); "If It Isn't Broken, Why Fix It? Ongoing Development of an Established Program" (Gloria Jaffe); "Starting at the Beginning: Program Assessment as Part of Program Design" (Meg Morgan); "Accreditation: Time to Act" (Katherine Staples); and "A Case for Program Review, Not Certification" (Sherry Burgus Little). The proceedings also includes a message from the president of CPTSC, the conference program, and results of the annual business meeting. Appendixes present the constitution, a list of meeting sites and dates, a list of members, and draft documents from the Program Review Board Planning Committee. (RS)

ED 361 782

CPTSC

The Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication

Proceedings
1991

Cincinnati,
Ohio

CS508294

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Daniel Riordan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Preparation of the *Proceedings* is supported in part by the Department of Language, Literature, and Communication, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

PROCEEDINGS

The Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication

18th Annual Conference

Cincinnati, Ohio
October 10-12, 1991

James P. Zappen
Executive Editor

Susan Katz
Managing Editor

The papers in these proceedings were reproduced from originals provided by the authors. The opinions in the papers are the responsibility of the authors, not of the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication.

Any papers may be reproduced without the permission of the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication, if the author and the Council are credited appropriately.

Contents

Message from the President: Working to Be the Best vii

Program of the 18th Annual Meeting ix

Benchmarks for Quality: Developing Criteria for Review 1

Program Development: How Do You Keep up with the Technology? 3
Martha C. Sammons, Wright State University

The Place of Rhetoric in the Technical Communication Program 7
Carolyn D. Rude, Texas Tech University

The Need for a Model Program Guide 15
Chuck Nelson, Youngstown State University

Who Are the Faculty of the CPTSC? 17
Maria Curro Kreppel, University of Cincinnati

Developing Criteria for Review: What Manuscript Referees Have to Say 23
Mary M. Lay, University of Minnesota

Walking the Tightrope: Balancing the Concerns of Industry and Academia 33

Program Development and Workplace Realities 35
Stephen A. Bernhardt, New Mexico State University

The "Is/Ought" Tension in Technical and Scientific Communication Program Development 51
Bob Johnson, Miami University of Ohio

New Mexico Tech's Technical Communication Program: Introducing a Corporate Board 55
Lynn Deming, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

Articulating Goals for a University/Corporate Advisory Board.....59
Deborah S. Bosley, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Benefits of a Review and Rating System.....67
Chris Velotta, NCR Corporation

Views from the Trenches: Case Studies in Progress.....71

Assessing Program Self-Assessment: A View from the Trenches.....73
Carol S. Lipson, Syracuse University

If It Isn't Broken, Why Fix It? Ongoing Development of an Established Program.....85
Gloria Jaffe, University of Central Florida

Starting at the Beginning: Program Assessment as Part of Program Design.....89
Meg Morgan, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Review, Certification, Accreditation–Is It Time to Decide?.....99

Accreditation: Time to Act.....101
Katherine Staples, Austin Community College

A Case for Program Review, Not Certification.....105
Sherry Burgus Little, San Diego State University

18th Annual Business Meeting.....111

Agenda.....113

Minutes.....114

Financial Report.....118

Executive Committee Meetings 119

Minutes 10/10 121

Minutes 10/12 122

Appendices 123

Appendix A: List of Conferees 125

Appendix B: Annual Meetings, Sites, and Dates 127

Appendix C: 1991 CPTSC Officers 128

Appendix D: CPTSC Members List 129

Appendix E: Constitution of the CPTSC 136

Appendix F: Program Review Board Planning Committee: Draft Documents 141

Application for CPTSC Program Review 143

Guidelines for Self-Study to Precede CPTSC Visit 150

CPTSC
The Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication

PRESIDENT

Sam Geonetta
College of Applied Science
University of Cincinnati
2220 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati OH 45206
(513) 753-5449

VICE PRESIDENT

James P Zappen
Department of Language,
Literature, and Communication
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy NY 12180-3590
(518) 276-8117

SECRETARY

Sherry Burgus Little
Department of English and
Comparative Literature
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182-0295
(619) 594-5238

TREASURER

Laurie S Hayes
Department of Rhetoric
University of Minnesota
St Paul, MN 55108
(612) 642-7451

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

Mary Coney
Department of Technical Communication
University of Washington
14 Loew Hall FH-40
Seattle, WA 98195
(206) 543-4557

Daniel Riordan
150B Harvey Hall
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751
(715) 232-1629

Karen A Schriver
Department of English
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 826-8791

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

Marilyn Schauer Samuels
Department of English
Guilford House
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland OH 44106

PAST PRESIDENTS

Patrick M Kelley
Virginia A Book
David L Carson
Thomas L Warren
Thomas E Pearsall

Working To Be The Best

Because I grew up extremely shy I had absolutely no interest in teaching or the field of communication. My junior year in high school I was forced to take a course in speech communication, despite my protests that Driver's Education would be better for me. In that course I was lucky enough to have a demanding, professional teacher who helped me come out of my shell with his clear guidance and strong evaluations. Throughout my education in communication I found that my best teachers did the same thing. Their efforts helped to nurture me as a student and made me want to be the best at what I wanted to do: teach communication.

When I became a member of the CPTSC I found a group of individuals who served as my guides in developing an academic program in technical communication. The group's members helped nurture me as a professional and made me want to be the best at what I wanted to do: teach technical communication. I still see this in CPTSC today as its members help others develop programs through a network that has grown as the discipline has grown. I often have been asked for the names of CPTSC members by individuals who are either starting or evaluating programs: without exception the members have given their expertise and time to new colleagues. This attitude of helpfulness and nurturing has now grown as the profession has grown: the initiative to establish a Program Review Board started by my predecessor, Marilyn Samuels, and developed under the leadership of Henrietta Nickels Shirk, reached a new point at the Annual Meeting in Cincinnati. The attitudes and ideas that have largely been informally implemented by individual members are taking form as a group effort sponsored by the CPTSC. The beauty of the discussion in Cincinnati was the strong emphasis on retaining the personal attention brought by individuals as they helped colleagues define and evaluate programs in technical communication. The recognition that this must be the attitude brought to group action represented by a Program Review Board showed the same concern that makes for the best guidance and evaluation. All this can do is achieve what we all want: the best possible programs in technical communication.

I personally thank each of you for your contributions as we have worked in developing a method of program review. I look forward to a productive Annual Meeting in Boise, Idaho, where we can see the full implementation of our review program. It's a big, positive step, that can help us achieve one of the key goals of our group: to assist in the development and evaluation of programs in technical and scientific communication.

My best,

Sam Geonetta

Sam Geonetta
President

PROGRAM

18th Annual Meeting
The Council for Programs
in Technical and Scientific Communication

October 10, 11, 12, 1991
Terrace Hilton Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio
Host: Department of Humanities, Social Sciences,
and Communication
College of Applied Science of the University of Cincinnati

Meeting Theme:
Program Development and Review: Issues, Questions, and Controversies

Thursday, October 10, 7 p.m.
Reception, Valley Room
Meeting packets available
Program exhibits and materials

Friday, October 11,
7:45 a.m. Continental breakfast, Parlor A Room

8:30 a.m. Greetings and introductions
Sam Geonetta, University of Cincinnati
Lawrence G. Gilligan, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Applied Science

Morning Sessions:
9:00 a.m. **Benchmarks for Quality: Developing Criteria for Review**
-Martha Sammons, Wright State University
-Carolyn Rude, Texas Tech University
-Chuck Nelson, Youngstown State University
-Maria Kreppel, University of Cincinnati
College of Applied Science
-Mary Lay, University of Minnesota
9:30 a.m. Discussion
Moderator: Karen Schriver, Carnegie-Mellon University

10:30 a.m. Break

10:45 a.m. **Walking the Tightrope: Balancing the Concerns of Industry and Academia**
-Stephen Bernhardt, New Mexico State University
-Robert R. Johnson, Miami University
-Lynn Deming, New Mexico Tech University
-Deborah Bosley, University of North Carolina
-Chris Velotta, NCR Corporation
11:15 a.m. Discussion
Moderator: Dan Riordan, University of Wisconsin-Stout

12:00 noon Lunch (on your own)

Afternoon Session:

2:00 p.m. **Views from the Trenches: Case Studies in Progress**
-Carol Lipson, Syracuse University
-Paul Anderson, Miami University
-Gloria Jaffe, University of Central Florida
-Meg Morgan, University of North Carolina

2:30 p.m. Discussion
Moderator: Mary Coney, University of Washington

3:15 p.m. Break

3:30 p.m. **Review, Certification, Accreditation--Is It Time to Decide?**
-Leslie Olsen, University of Michigan
-Katherine Staples, Austin Community College
-Freda Stohrer, Air Force Institute of Technology
-Sherry Little, San Diego State University

4:00 p.m. Discussion
Moderator: James Zappen, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

5:00 p.m. Free Time

7:00 p.m. Banquet, Ohio Room
Cash Bar, 7:00-7:30

Saturday, October 12
Breakfast (on your own)

9:00-11:30 a.m. Annual Business Meeting, Parlor A Room

12:00 noon-2:30 p.m. Luncheon and Tour, College of Applied Science

Benchmarks for Quality: Developing Criteria for Review

Program Development: How Do You Keep Up With the Technology

Martha C. Sammons
Professor of English
Wright State University

I have introduced four new courses into our technical writing certificate program: desktop publishing, advanced technical writing, technical editing, and topics in technical writing. However, I have encountered several obstacles in developing these courses that have resulted from trying to keep current with new technology in the field.

Students being prepared for jobs in technical communication need to know more than just writing skills. This fact is confirmed by articles in **Technical Communication** and other publications, job ads, and visits to the classroom from recruiters, freelancers and consultants, and practicing technical writers. As the field has broadened to include online documentation, hypertext and hypermedia, departments are now faced with training students in several areas.

First, students need a variety of software skills in both the Macintosh and PC environments. These skills, for example, include knowledge of word processing software (WordPerfect and Word), paint and drawing programs (Corel, Designer, Adobe Illustrator), page layout software (PageMaker and Ventura). In addition, students need background in design and layout, font and scanner technology, and other desktop publishing techniques. Finally, students also need training in more sophisticated areas such as writing online documentation, hypertext and hypermedia, and computer-based training, including interactive videodisc technology.

Issues for the Technical Writing Department

As a result of these student needs, the technical writing department is faced with these issues:

- **funding the hardware and software**

The department needs to find rooms for computer labs, then purchase the hardware and software. Expenses include computer systems (both Mac and IBM) powerful enough to run the types of software now available, printers, scanners, multiple copies of a variety of software packages, and peripherals such as CD-ROM drives, videodisc players, etc. Once these items are purchased, it is necessary to continually upgrade both the hardware and software to keep up with changes.

- **hiring or training current faculty in new areas of technical communication**

We must hire new faculty who are familiar with this new technology; such individuals are difficult to find, or hiring may be impossible with current budget freezes. In addition, current faculty must constantly keep up-to-date on the latest trends in the field. To learn new technology, they must take courses, attend seminars and conferences, and/or do freelance work for industry. However, the best way to learn these fields requires hands-on experience, which is difficult for college faculty.

- **finding adequate textbooks and training materials in these areas**

While there are books available on most of the major software packages, training materials for universities have lagged behind the software upgrades. There are few, if any, books with practical exercises geared toward technical writing in the areas I have mentioned here.

• finding practical projects for students to apply their knowledge of online documentation and hypertext

When textbook exercises are difficult to find, it has been worthwhile to seek real projects throughout the university. While it is possible to find such projects for traditional topics such as writing articles, proposals, or manuals, finding projects in these newer areas is almost impossible and impractical.

Questions for Discussion

The issues I would like to raise are:

- do these newer areas (CBT, hypertext and hypermedia, online documentation) belong in technical writing department curricula?
- what are practical ways to solve the financial obstacles?
- what are ways current faculty can get hands-on training in these new areas?
- how can we encourage faculty and publishers to produce textbooks in more advanced areas of the field?
- how can industry work with universities to provide funding and training in exchange for more qualified students?

The Place of Rhetoric in the Technical Communication Program

Carolyn D. Rude
Associate Professor and Director of Technical Communication
Texas Tech University

Academics in technical communication resist definition of the subject for good reasons. The main reason is wariness of establishing narrow boundaries for the field. Such boundaries have been drawn before, as in the definitions of the 1960s that equated technical writing with features of style, especially clarity (Hays; Britton; Dandridge). These definitions negated the interpretive and analytic power of the writer by making him (rarely her) a conduit for the transfer of information from reality to representation on the page. Definitions have also rested on the assumption that the only subject matter for technical writing is technology. While the definitions based on style and subject matter may have served the epistemology and practice of their time, they seem reductive and limiting now and thereby seem to trivialize inquiry and teaching in this field.

The prospect of accreditation by the Society for Technical Communication (representing industry) and the reality of ongoing evaluation within the academy create an interesting context for the question of definition. We in the field may resist definition for good reasons, but if we do not establish our identity and goals, these will continue to be established for us. When we are defined from without, either by the academy or by industry, it is by their standards and perceptions, not ours. Unfortunately, the definitions from without, both from the academy and from industry, draw the boundaries in limiting and uncongenial ways. The academy, especially the English department, assumes a definition that implies (even when the words are not used) marginal, adjunct, trivial, and even amoral roles. Technical communication, in this view, serves technology at the expense of humanism; teaches skills, not substance and values; and focuses on superficial text characteristics, such as placement on the page. It is hard to predict what definitions industry might assume in its accreditation criteria, but other accrediting bodies, such as those in journalism and education, stress performance—the ability of graduates to fill particular jobs. There is a risk, with employer-oriented criteria, of creating vocational rather than academic programs. We could find ourselves evaluated (and defined) according to ability of graduates, say, to operate or program a computer—much easier to measure than the ability to make decisions or communicate effectively. Don Bush, with experience in both academia and industry, notes the greater rigidity and conformity to rules in industry while academia is comfortable with words such as "situation." Academics would resist being pressed solely into the confines of practice.

My purpose here is neither to provide nor to propose a formal definition of technical communication. Like Jo Allen, I question whether a formal definition can accommodate the complexity of technical writing or its future. A definition developed now would be as time-bound as those from the 1960s that we question in the 1990s. History suggests the improbability of a complete and lasting definition: the classical rhetoricians, from the Sophists through Quintilian, all debated the nature of rhetoric, trying definitions based on content, purpose, and style, and considering whether rhetoric was an art or knack. In centuries of debate, they never reached conclusions other than temporary ones that suited experience and particular aims. However, the inquiry itself and the statements that resulted aided them in understanding their purposes and in creating a public image. Those statements, in all their variety and difference, shape the ways in which we, looking back, evaluate them. Like the classical rhetoricians, we may need to be satisfied with statements that reflect our time and place.

It is in our best interests to affirm—even loudly—our traditions and goals in order to make sure that these influence the criteria by which we are evaluated, either informally or by a formal accreditation procedure. We need to establish our academic identity in the 1990s. The definitions imposed on us by industry or by the academy are uncongenial when they question or ignore our academic credentials. These definitions also focus on our products (the documents) and on features of these products (such as style) rather than on the broader context in which the documents are created and the theoretical assumptions that underlie their creation and use. This paper draws the outlines of our academic identity in an effort to establish some bases for evaluation criteria.

The most fruitful source as we look for our academic identity is the rhetorical tradition. Our academic credentials derive from our connections with this tradition. These connections establish a context for teaching technical writing. To understand the rhetorical tradition helps to give us a sense of our academic purposes and helps to establish a basis for decisions about emphasis and structure of the courses. Certainly linguistics, literary theory, cognitive psychology, art, and other disciplines have contributed to our field. However, these other disciplines are sources and influences; they help us discuss features of text by offering methods of discussing communication and insight into the way that documents function. Rhetoric is more comprehensive.

The study of rhetoric traditionally has aimed to equip students with an ability to identify problems and issues, to investigate, to interpret, and to communicate results—whatever the subject matter. These abilities require higher-level thinking, not just skills; analysis and evaluation, not just observation (though analysis may begin with observation). The study emphasizes strategies and practice rather than a body of facts and contemplation; thus, the study of rhetoric aims for social application. Students are studying rhetoric in a technical communication course even though they may never hear of Aristotle nor study history and theory of rhetoric. Identifying a problem, gathering, interpreting, and arranging information, choosing an appropriate style, and making recommendations, as students learn to do in preparing recommendation reports, proposals, and manuals, are rhetorical acts. In its best tradition, rhetoric insists on the responsible and ethical practice. This is the tradition in which we educate students. This tradition gives technical communication academic credentials through its central place in education for the entire history of western civilization. Preparing students for particular jobs and helping them acquire mastery over particular text features are only parts of this broad academic goal.

The bonds between rhetoric and technical communication are evident in current practice of rhetoric in the academy as well as in the tradition. Rhetoric and technical communication have common grounds in theory, research, and pedagogy. The most significant literature in technical communication draws on rhetoric, from the classical to the modern periods. The same issues of invention, audience, interpretation, discourse communities, genres, modes, structure, format, and pedagogy are raised in technical communication research as in rhetoric. Teaching in both composition and technical communication stresses workshops, collaboration, and student texts, even though the genres and goals may differ in the freshman composition and technical communication classes. Technical communication, however, is more than derivative. Studies and practice in technical communication contribute to understanding of issues in rhetoric, particularly on audience, ethics, format, and collaboration. Practice defines issues for research and an opportunity for testing theories.

These bonds still allow for differences in the way writing classes are taught. Technical communication classes differ from freshman composition classes though both share a tradition. Students write at different levels of maturity in these classes and with different genres. These differences should be valued rather than eliminated. Claiming the rhetorical tradition for our own also does not require that writing classes suddenly become history and theory classes. Students can learn technical communication without knowing the history and tradition of rhetoric (but their teachers probably should know this history).

The rhetorical nature of technical communication was discussed about ten years ago in a productive way for technical communication. (See Masse and Benz for a bibliographic essay on the topic.) Some of the discussion led to the rejection (or at least expansion) of the 1960s definitions. For example, analysts focusing on the topic of style discovered metaphor and ambiguity in technical communication as well as in literary texts. Others discovered applications of Aristotle's taxonomies to technical communication genres and methods and the persuasive character of technical communication. These observations drew us away from the "one meaning and only one meaning" definition of technical writing (Britton).

This discussion, however, emphasized features of texts rather than the context. The articles in this sense followed the 1960s definitions in regarding technical writing in terms of its objects (the documents), perhaps reflecting that the subject matter of the documents often concerned objects. Few articles considered the epistemological bases for the comparison, with several articles by

Carolyn Miller and David Dobrin being notable exceptions. The relation of technical communication to the rhetorical tradition has less to do with features of style and elements of persuasion in technical writing or with the canons and classifications of argument than with epistemology. Definitions of technical writing based on style assume the possibility of certain knowledge, while rhetoric is a means of achieving probable knowledge. Perhaps the most compelling reason for moving beyond 1960s concepts is the sweeping change in epistemology of the later twentieth century and the questioning of absolute knowledge, even that produced by science. The text, given this epistemology, does not represent reality; rather, reality is created through negotiations between writer and reader with the text being a vehicle for these negotiations. As Stanley Fish says, "properly used, rhetoric is a heuristic" that helps us to discover the facts (206). As interpreters as well as observers, as makers of knowledge rather than mere recorders, technical writers have greater social responsibility than to master literary style. To insist that technical communication concerns absolute truth rather than the contingent or probable (that is, to deny the rhetorical nature of technical communication) is to remain in an epistemological graveyard.

The previous conversation about the relation of technical writing to rhetoric has been an internal one; it remained mostly within the technical communication journals. Because we identified some connections for ourselves, it is surprising to see some incidental evidence that rhetoricians may be drawing boundaries around their discipline that exclude technical communication. For example, the 1991 CCCC program lists journals of interest to members but includes none of the technical communication journals. The Bedford Bibliography proclaims the interdisciplinary nature of rhetoric and includes citations from linguistics and psychology but none from technical communication. Some rhetoricians, like the literature faculty, seem to believe that while rhetoric is grounded in the tradition of humanism, technical communication is merely a tool of business and technology and that while rhetoric concerns invention and argument, technical communication is excessively concerned with style and form. Evidence of misperceptions about technical communication within the English department, especially from the people who should best understand, suggests that our public statements of our identity and purposes have been too quiet. The misperceptions result in evaluations that diminish what we do and that disconnect us from tradition.

Industry might rate us high for the very characteristics that the academy diminishes. That is, with its orientation to correctness, style, and knowledge of technology, industry might impose evaluation criteria that insist on the very emphases that the academy rejects. Our connections with industry are important and valuable, not just because we hope our students will find jobs but also because our research depends on practice. Still, as educators, we aim to empower students for thoughtful and productive lives overall, not just to prepare them for jobs. Preparing students to meet the standards of industry is part of helping them become productive, but evaluation criteria must respect the broader mission as well as ensuring a certain level of skills.

Existing definitions of technical communication from both the academy and industry, even though informal, shape the evaluation of academic programs. The two groups tug us in different ways, but the response to both is to assert our academic identity. To know this identity requires us to look beyond words on the page to our traditions and to the contexts in which we teach and documents are used. Knowing who we are academically gives us power to define ourselves rather than to let ourselves be molded in the hands of others.

Works Cited

Allen, Jo. "The Case Against Defining Technical Writing." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 4.2 (1990): 68-77.

Britton, W. Earl. "What is Technical Writing? A Redefinition." *College Composition and Communication* 16 (1965): 113-16.

Bush, Don. "Comparing the Two Cultures in Technical Writing." *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 34.2 (1991): 67-69.

Dandridge, Edmund P., Jr. "Notes toward a Definition of Technical Writing." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 3 (1973): 265-71.

Dobrin, David. "Is Technical Writing Particularly Objective?" *College English* 47.3 (1985): 237-251.

Fish, Stanley. "Rhetoric." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. 203-22.

Hays, Robert. "What is Technical Writing?" *Word Study* 36.4 (1961): 1-4.

Masse, Roger E., and Martha Delamater Benz. "Technical Communication and Rhetoric." *Technical and Business Communication: Bibliographic Essays for Teachers and Corporate Trainers*. Ed. Charles H. Sides. Urbana: NCTE, 1989. 5-38.

Miller, Carolyn R. "A Humanistic Rationale for Technical Writing." *College English* 40.6 (1979): 610-17.

—. "Comment and Response: Carolyn Miller Responds." *College English* 41.7 (1980): 825-27.

The Need for a Model Program Guide

Chuck Nelson

Co-Director, Professional Writing and Editing

Youngstown State University

The last STC directory of *Academic Programs in Technical Communication*, 1985, lists over fifty programs. By 1989 the number of programs asking to be included in a new edition had grown to 150. As the number of new programs increases and as more programs reach middle age, the question of program quality becomes as tricky as it is volatile.

I feel that inclusion of a technical communication program in a directory published by STC does, to some extent, legitimize it. Although an "open door" listing of every program--the good, the bad, and the ugly--may be useful statistically, it provides little help for a student trying to select a quality program or for a program administrator looking for guidance on ways to improve a technical writing and editing program.

The solution that I am proposing is simply (in fact, of course, not so simply) provide those interested with examples of program excellence in our field. One could start by devising a taxonomy of professional communication programs. Certain obvious types come quickly to mind: certificate, associate, undergraduate, graduate. Then identify common variations within each type, e.g., an undergraduate major within and without an English department or a pre- and post-baccalaureate certificate. Next describe the philosophy, curriculum, organization, faculty, students, facilities, history, success of the program in such detail that it could stand as a meaningful example of a model that works.

The National Council of Teachers of English has just published *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition* by Timothy Donovan and Ben McClelland. The book's blurb explains: "The course options offered here to college composition teachers focus on process. . . . In each essay the theoretical approach is accompanied by a detailed description of a composition course." There is no suggestion that these courses are the best. What our profession needs is a similar set of models that flesh out various types of program processes that work.

Such a resource would provide program directors with a positively geared method of self-assessment. The substance of these models would help us recognize the presence or lack of program quality, thus suggesting what aspects of a program need to be maintained and what aspects might best be modified.

Who are the Faculty of the CPTSC?

Maria Curro Kreppel
Associate Professor of English
University of Cincinnati

Our struggle toward a recognized and accepted profession of technical communication has been palpable for decades. We are no longer a renegade band, schooled in English or American or Medieval literature, but lured by the call of the wild post-war technologies to speak in different tongues. Today we are artists and theorists and scholar/practitioners carrying traditional credentials, but also armed with new degrees named for the discipline we seek to create. We come equipped with software and rhetorical literacy. We teach and research the processes of oral, written and graphic communication within the cabled world of voice/data/video. Today's diversity makes us richer but intensifies the struggle. While we work to define and develop the academic programs of technical and scientific communication, we continue to stumble over the need to define ourselves.

Self study is further challenged by the fact that we do our professional work in separate academic cultures. Some of us speak agriculture, some business management, some physics, some desktop publishing, some Japanese. How can we create a context for ourselves? How can we avoid among ourselves the very babble we seek to eradicate elsewhere?

In a recent article in *Technical Communication*, Suzanne Roberts proposes that "technical writing professors are the human link needed to expedite the transfer of technology across traditional discourse boundaries because of our specific understanding and training in the art of rhetoric, particularly rhetoric that is defined by the process by which people arrive at knowledge" (340). If so, our quest for self-knowledge tests these very attributes. The challenge is to cross the discourse boundaries among ourselves in order to forge the self-knowledge essential to develop our programs and profession.

Our dialogue may be usefully framed by several national faculty studies. Their data and analyses provide norms against which a collective profile may take its shape. Three 1990 reports from the National Center for Education Statistics synthesize data from more than 11,000 faculty members, department chairs, and institutional academic officers on issues including job satisfaction, workload, professional development, appointment and promotion practices, academic department characteristics, tenure systems and distribution of academic ranks. Additional studies should be used for their more focused analyses. In particular, *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey* probes faculty interests and goals as they align themselves or veer away from faculty job responsibilities.

These studies assist us in mapping our own experience against the full range of the academic enterprise. Do our programs now cover the spectrum of institutional structures--from research and doctorate-granting universities, through comprehensive and liberal arts institutions, to two-year community and technical colleges? At what kinds of institutions are new degrees and programs prospering? Where are technical and scientific communication faculty, in the departmental homes of their particular disciplines or in interdisciplinary and integrative academic units? On what tasks do we spend our professional time? How do our percentages of teaching, research and administrative time compare to those of our colleagues at peer institutions? Are we successfully defining promotion and tenure criteria for ourselves, and are we educating those colleagues and administrators involved in academic reviews? In short, how are technical and scientific communication faculty living and working within their diverse academic environments?

Especially appropriate for technical communication faculty is Ernest Boyer's report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Boyer uses data from more than 5,000 faculty representing 300 different institutions to argue effectively for a "new generation of scholars" who recognize that "teaching is crucial, that integrative studies are increasingly consequential, and that, in addition to research, the work of the academy must relate to the world beyond the campus" (65). He observes that today's "researchers feel the need to move beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries, communicate with colleagues in other fields and discover patterns that connect" (20).

To this end, Boyer proposes four kinds of "necessary" scholarship. First is the scholarship of discovery, the free inquiry and investigation among peers marked by rigorous methodology of the specific discipline. This most traditional definition of scholarship is, of course, associated with mature disciplines and the research universities wherein specialists train their successors. Second is the scholarship of integration, the synthesizing work of placing specialties within their larger contexts and making connections across the disciplines. Third is the scholarship of application, the work of professional service, of asking how new knowledge may be applied to relevant problems. Fourth is the scholarship of teaching, the work of the "classroom-researcher" grounded in the awareness that our professional work has meaning only as it may be understood by others. As the profession of scientific and technical communication has developed over this century, so has the full range of scholarship Ernest Boyer advocates. Our discipline strives, by its very nature, toward a more inclusive definition of scholarly work.

If Ernest Boyer judges correctly that, "Today, interdisciplinary and integrative studies, long on the edges of academic life, are moving toward the center, responding both to new intellectual questions and to pressing human problems," then the time of our profession is nigh (21). Let's be ready for the challenge that awaits us.

Works Cited

Astin, Alexander W., William S. Korn and Eric L. Dey. *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles: HERI, 1991.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.

1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty. *A Descriptive Report of Academic Departments in Higher Education Institutions*. Washington D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1990.

1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty. *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1990.

1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty. *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1990.

Roberts, Suzanne. "Technology Transfer: An Opportunity for Technical Communicators." *Technical Communication*, third quarter 1991: 336-344.

Developing Criteria for Review: What Manuscript Referees Have to Say

Mary M. Lay
Associate Professor
University of Minnesota

In thinking about what criteria any program review board might use to help colleagues develop undergraduate and graduate programs in technical and scientific communication, and after reading CPTSC's proposed "Application" and "Guidelines" for review, I studied my most available source for standards of excellence--manuscript referees' comments. As co-editor of *The Technical Writing Teacher* (or now the *Technical Communication Quarterly*), I had access to the referees' comments on some 30 manuscripts that had been submitted to the journal over the last 10 months. These comments indicate what referees consider quality and can be matched to a great extent to the questions that CPTSC consultants might ask of program administrators.

In the list that follows, I have collected the most global and frequent comments from the journal's referees under these categories: teaching; research; cognitive characteristics; balance; relationship with industry; organization and structure; content; and significance. For example, when assessing a manuscript a referee would ask that the author present a clear focus and purpose and contribute to the knowledge base in technical and scientific communication. I have highlighted key words in boldface.

After compiling this list, I then went through the "Application" and "Guidelines" forms distributed to CPTSC members in Fall 1991. My purpose was to see, even though I might be comparing "apples and oranges," whether CPTSC was looking for the same quality characteristics in a program that manuscript referees sought in their reading. After all, manuscript referees are usually program administrators, active scholars, and conscientious teachers, and the faculty from the programs that CPTSC might be reviewing would be publishing in journals such as the one I co-edit. In square brackets, I have indicated the questions asked by CPTSC that might match the standards applied by referees to manuscripts (the numbers, such as SSIIA1 or 11a indicate the appropriate question from the self-study or the application, respectively). For example, if a manuscript referee asked that an author contribute to the knowledge base, in the self-study questionnaire CPTSC asked how faculty development was supported in the program.

The following list then indicates the standards used by manuscript referees and by the CPTSC and the overlap and gaps:

What standards are being used by *TCQ* manuscript referees?

[What is being asked in the CPTSC program review application [number] and self-study [SS-number]?]

I. Teaching

Demonstrate thorough knowledge of **current pedagogical approaches.**
[SSIIA1 What Scientific and Technical Communication courses are currently taught in your department? How are they related? Which required? Prerequisites?]
[SSIVA2-3 What kind of training and experience do teachers have? How are high-quality teaching and research rewarded?]

Present in detail how something is taught.
[SSIIC--Methods for dealing with student writing? Classroom activities? Textbooks? Instructional materials and media? Computer facilities?]

Avoid busy work in courses.
[SSIIC2 What kinds of classroom activities are most common?]

Acknowledge the differences between teaching writing to technical students and teaching professional communicators.
[11a How do you define your program? Technical writing program. Technical communication program?]
[11b What does the above program nomenclature mean for you practically and philosophically]

II. Research

[19 In what areas have your program faculty received their terminal degrees?]

[20 In what areas are your program faculty conducting research/scholarship?]

[SSIVA2 What is the record of teachers' research, publication, and conference participation]

Contribute to knowledge base.

[SSIVB How is faculty development supported?]

Present a **practical** and **timely** subject.

Conduct **thorough** and **honest** research--do not misrepresent findings.

Appreciate both **quantitative and qualitative methodology.**

Set comments within context of **past research/theory.**

Avoid using outdated theory.

Tie to **recent related** work or research.

Suggest **alternatives to past/current research.**

III. Cognitive Characteristics

Avoid **myth of objectivity**.

State and **prove the thesis.**

Rank and **evaluate** various approaches.

Distinguish between research approaches and between teaching approaches.

Avoid superficial analysis.

Express opinion or evaluation--not just description of what others have said.

Understand needs of audience.

Ask the "so what" question.

Be critical.

Be aware of potential misuse of suggestions.

Give convincing reasons for recommendations.

Be realistic.

Display a theoretical basis.

Avoid "this is how we did it" approach.

Focus on problem and theoretical rationale for solving that problem.

Be well-researched.
[SSEnd--Provide statistical information--enrollments, class sizes, vitae, evaluations, etc.]

Demonstrate how meanings of technical objects are socially constructed.

Do a solid rhetorical analysis of a case.

Be aware of unstated assumptions.

Take care in **making the transition from data to conclusions.**
[SSIIE1-3 Grading system? Determination of grades in each course?]

Make sure that the **details or examples indeed support the final thesis.**
[SSIID1 What tests and testing procedures does the program currently use for placement and exemption?]
[SSIID2-3 Placement decisions? Test administration?]

Help audience interpret **graphics** that are used in manuscript.
[16a Do you have any laboratories associated with your Scientific and Technical Communication program--photography, video, print lab, computers, graphics, etc.?]

Display knowledge of **history of the field.**
[15a Do you have any courses that introduce students to the discipline of Scientific and Technical Communication?]

Have knowledge of **educational theory.**

Have knowledge of **classical rhetoric** and **rhetoric of science**--and knowledge of limitations of these theories.

Have knowledge of the **hot topics**--such as hypertext.

IV. Balance

[SSIIB8-11 Courses in speaking and oral presentation? in reading skills? in research methodology? in pedagogy?]

Make clear the **relationships between teaching and research.**

Demonstrate knowledge of how **other disciplines** can help technical communication solve problems.

[SSIIA2 What courses supporting Scientific and Technical Communication are offered by areas outside your department?]

Avoid being **too inclusive or exclusive.**

VI. Relationship with Industry.

[21 How many faculty have industry experience (full-time industry experience? part-time consulting?)]

Have knowledge of **current industrial practices**--e.g., usability testing.

Be realistic about ethical problems/solutions in relation to how technical communicators get and keep their jobs.

Experience industry first hand.
[SSIIF1-3 Student internships]

Know **prohibitions or limitations** within industry.

Prepare technical communicators for **writing tasks** and what kind of **feedback** they will get on the job.

VII. Organization and Structure

Have a **clear focus and purpose.**
[SSIIA3 What are the goals of the program]

Titles should convey the real nature.

Explain as you go.

Have **focus** and **coherence.**
[SSIIB1 Does each Scientific and Technical Communication course have a standard syllabus?]

Have **appropriate length.**

Develop **order/sequence** that makes **sense.**
[SSIIB2 Is there a logical sequence of courses and of course units or assignments for each course?]

Organize around **substantive topics.**

Choose appropriate **discourse format**--analysis versus narrative or description.

Make sure **audience** has **necessary background** to understand.

Display secondary materials carefully--e.g., make sure text citations and reference lists match.

VIII. Content

Raise issues that are **exciting and important.**

Avoid simply teaching technical applications--e.g. teaching desk top publishing versus teaching design analysis.

Look at **recent events**--such as the Challenger--and what lessons we can learn.

IX. Significance

Acknowledge **impacts** on society and culture.

Set comments in reference to **culture or community**--e.g., industrial.

Be aware of **environment**--discourse community--in describing and making recommendations.

Affect change in technical writers' jobs or positions.

Ask **important questions** and **provide answers.**

Know **purpose of university**--prepare human beings for a lifetime of learning, not just to serve the needs of industry.

Quality Features Covered Well in the CPTSC Review

I found that the following characteristics were sought in manuscript review and were covered well in the proposed CPTSC review:

1. Teaching based on current approaches, approaches that are described in detail, geared toward meaningful assignments, and differ depending on whether the courses are for technical students or professional communication majors.

2. Research measured by professional participation--contribution to the knowledge base.

3. Evidence and support--the research in journal articles and questions asked in the self-study require complete and meaningful data.

4. Curriculum that acknowledges the importance of not only writing but also visual and oral communication.

5. Connections with industry that inform the curriculum.

6. Clear programmatic focus and a coherent structure. Clearly defined requirements, sequence, and prerequisites.

Features That Might Need Greater Emphasis in CPTSC Review

The features listed below were ones that manuscript referees sought but that were not covered in the CPTSC proposed review mechanism. They will have to be included or assessed carefully during campus visits.

1. Research subjects that are timely, practical, supported by thorough qualitative or quantitative research. Scholarship that uses contemporary theory but builds upon or suggests alternatives to past theories.

2. Research or scholarship that demonstrates appropriate cognitive skills--such as avoiding scientific positivism, acknowledging social construction of meaning, employing identifiable and appropriate methodology--such as rhetorical analysis.

3. Curriculum that is not too institutionally specific--that is, takes into account contemporary concerns in the field.

4. Recognition that teaching and research inform each other.

5. Thorough knowledge of the limitations and pressures on technical writers as well as the opportunities they may have to affect change. Resistance to pressure from industry to gear curriculum solely to industrial needs.

6. Curriculum that avoids teaching technical applications only--e.g. courses should teach design principles and publications management rather than such skills as desktop publishing.

7. Course work that analyzes real-world events. Exploration of social and cultural impact within courses.

I hope that this study will prove useful to CPTSC consultants are they help institutions develop and access technical and scientific communication programs. And, I thank all the manuscript referees who do such a fine job in helping authors refine their work submitted to the journal.

Walking the Tightrope: Balancing the Concerns of Industry and Academia

Program Development and Workplace Realities

Stephen A. Bernhardt
Associate Professor
Department of English, Box 3E
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Programs in technical communication strive to be well informed by prevailing practices in the workplace. In fact, a whole genre of essays and research builds upon the relationship between what is taught in the academy and what is expected in the workplace, often with a strong element of self-critical appraisal. More than most university programs, and certainly more than other areas of emphasis within English departments, technical communication programs pursue a good understanding of and a close articulation with business and industry.

My goal in this short position paper is to call attention to a useful area of discussion with which some technical communicators may not be familiar: **workplace literacy**. Definitions of workplace literacy attempt to nail down exactly what skills are essential for successful entry into the workplace. These defined skills are undergoing rapid reconceptualization as the nature of work and the workplace changes. It is very common now to hear talk of "upskilling" the workforce–of giving all workers the skills to produce quality goods and services; to play responsible, decision-making roles in their organizations; and to bring enhanced technological and information-based literacies into the workplace.

Workplace literacy has emerged within the past few years as a shared concern of government, business, and industry. There is a remarkable consensus among various groups regarding certain central competencies that define the basic skills that collectively constitute workplace literacy. As we shape our programs, we should consider the demands the workplace and the government are issuing through their calls for increased workplace literacy. To develop sound technical communication programs, we ought to be aware of what's going on in workplace literacy, who is leading the initiatives, what the prevailing philosophies are, and how schools might respond.

To a large extent, workplace literacy initiatives are dominated by two Federal Departments: Labor and Education. Both have issued reports, funded demonstration projects, and convened blue ribbon panels to construct a program for workplace development. Additional initiatives are sponsored by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), where many of the materials and methods of instruction in basic workplace skills are being developed. Labor, Education, and ASTD's interests are cross-fertilized–the same experts turn up on different committees and panels.

We should consider the extent to which our programs address the needs identified by the workplace. To do so, we need to look toward the workplace to assess its demands as well as look back toward the public schools to assess their performance. As we do so, we should consider that students in our classes actually comprise two groups: those students who complete degrees and the large proportion of students who drop out of college sometime during their first or second year (about half at many universities). We should also take into account the projection that by the year 2000, more than 70 percent of the jobs in America will not require a college education (National Center on Education and the Economy, *America's Choice* 3). What we do in our technical communication courses needs to be geared toward both workplace skills and toward continued communication in school environments.

Behavioral and Social Skills: A Good Work Ethic

The calls for improved workplace literacy often redefine what is meant by basic skills. Featured prominently are skills that are largely behavioral or social, behaviors that when taken together constitute a strong work ethic (Natriello). *America's Choice: high skills or low wages* reports:

> Our research did reveal a wide range of concerns covered under the blanket term of "skills." While businesses everywhere complained about the quality of their applicants, few talked about the kinds of skills acquired in school. The primary concern of more than 80 percent of employers was finding workers with a good work ethic and appropriate social behavior: 'reliable,' 'a good attitude,' 'a pleasant appearance,' 'a good personality.' (National Center on Education and the Economy 3)

When asked, business says it needs people who have good attitudes, who can work independently, who can function as team members, who are responsible and dependable, and who show other behaviors that generally characterize a good work ethic.

In many ways, technical communication courses offer a good opportunity to develop these sorts of skills. Favored here would be assignments that pose real problems, that require students to work within time and resource constraints, and that require students to work with classmates and people outside the course. It is less clear how we might assure that students present a good appearance or have a pleasant personality.

Some within our profession might question whether producing "good little worker bees" is really an appropriate goal for the university. To what extent do our programs contribute to developing such a workforce? Should they? Are we in any way obligated to provide a workforce that has traditional Puritan virtues? Does responding to this need constitute capitulation to the demands of the workplace for a docile, cooperative workforce?

How universally accepted are such qualities as observing deadlines, being cooperative, being dependable, and so on? I watch students, undergraduate and particularly graduate, repeatedly have a difficult time meeting deadlines, coordinating group activities, or acting in ways I would characterize as dependable. My inclination is to work for program and course development in ways that insure that students must frequently demonstrate those behaviors that collectively constitute what would be called a good work ethic. But I realize that in doing so I can be criticized for being a willing player in creating students who fit well into business occupations.

Business recognizes that it can give on-the-job training in necessary technical skills. A willing, cooperative worker will learn what it takes to do the job. When business fires workers, it is not because of a lack of skill, but because of personal/interpersonal habits. In the same way, schools have never tossed aside students who had trouble learning; they toss aside the trouble makers, those without the willingness or without sufficient self-discipline to behave in ways the system will tolerate. In this negative sense, schools have always shaped behavior. The question is whether we ought to take a proactive stance in identifying and helping students consciously develop the behavioral and social skills that comprise a good work ethic.

Oral Communication Skills: Speaking and Listening

In addition to general behaviors and social skills, the calls for workplace literacy tend to stress strong oral communication skills. The workplace needs people who can listen well, respond to both content and feeling in other people's words, negotiate and compromise, and participate in efficient and supportive ways in group discussion. At least some businesses call for people with aggressive interpersonal skills–strong negotiating or persuading skills, the ability to direct others, and the willingness to defend positions and offer criticism. The need for heightened oral communication skills is increased by the general movement toward a service economy within an information-based society. One prediction holds that about 90 percent of new jobs through 1995 will be in services, compared with about 8 percent in manufacturing (U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Education, *Bottom Line* 3). The drive toward restructured industries based, in part, on participatory management through increased front-line authority and reduced middle management also increases the pressure on industry to look for workers with highly developed oral skills.

Many businesses recognize the need for employees who can communicate well face-to-face or via telephone. The training industry is geared toward giving existing workers these skills, and we need to reconsider the place of oral communication in our programs. It is all too common for oral communication, if incorporated into our programs at all, to consist of a unit of short speeches or project presentations.

There are probably better ways to develop communicative competence in our students. Role playing is one avenue--having students act out scenarios that focus on situations where communication is likely to be difficult or strained. Again, assignments that take people to human resources in the university or the community is another way to encourage the development of interaction skills. Here, too, is where we can legitimately raise issues of power in discourse: who does the speaking when and under what rules. We have a wealth of scholarship on gender roles in communication, on cross-cultural communication, and on the ways that status and power are reflected in and created through shared discourse. Just as we ask students to develop metacognitive awareness of their own writing processes, we need to give them the tools and encourage them to be analytical about their own processes and patterns of oral interaction.

We also can carve out roles for ourselves on campus as advocates of active participation by students in their own learning. Education that expects students to be passive absorbers of information cannot turn out workers who take active, participatory roles in work settings.

Our journals, our programs of study, and our conventions tend to reflect the fact that we see ourselves as involved in a larger enterprise than simply *technical writing*. We say *technical communication* or *professional communication* to remind ourselves and to indicate to the world that our provenance is larger than written reports. Yet the bulk of our discussion, our research, and our coursework focuses on written communication. We need to seek a balance that integrates the full range of oral competencies with written competencies.

Adaptive Reading and Writing Skills: Handling the Information Load

We need to consider the paperwork demands of typical office or production environments and address the need for adaptive reading and writing strategies. In doing so, we would reconsider our definitions of typical reading and writing behaviors, we would examine how work uses and documents information, and we would weigh questions of communicative efficiency.

Too often, the reading strategies that are reflected in technical communication classes presuppose certain behaviors that are more characteristic of students in the classroom than of workers on the job. Students need strategies for sifting through large quantities of information to find what is useful. They need to read complex documents to extract key information on which to take action. We need to encourage reading strategies that value navigating, searching, skimming, and filtering large pools of information. Instead, too often, we offer them short textbook chapters to read and then beat this limited amount of text into the ground through extended discussions.

Similarly, we need to examine our presuppositions about writing--especially the conventions of authorship, ownership, and use of information. Many businesses now build or assemble documents, rather than creating them from scratch. Authorship is important in different ways than in the academy, and rules governing use and attribution are quite different once one leaves the academy. Students need to know how to boilerplate documents, what fair use rules are for graphics or written materials, and what the conventions are (if there are any consistent conventions) for documenting sources.

Really, what we need to move toward, is a definition of information skills, rather than simply reading or writing skills.

Computer Skills

Computer skills are rapidly entering into the standard definitions of basic skills. The U. S. Department of Education, in particular, has been receiving a steady stream of suggestions that they move to include computer skills as a basic sort of literacy, not a specialized technical skill. The SCANS report (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills) targets computer/information skills under several of its competencies:

- **Information**–acquiring and evaluating data, organizing and maintaining files, interpreting and communicating, and using computers to process information;
- **Systems**–understanding social, organizational, and technological systems, monitoring and correcting performance, and designing or improving systems;
- **Technology**–selecting equipment and tools, applying technology to specific tasks, and maintaining and troubleshooting technologies. (U.S. Department of Labor)

The Commission suggests that all public school graduates have these skills in order to be productive in the workforce. Reread that list and imagine to yourself whether all high school graduates have such skills. Imagine, again, whether all college graduates have such skills.

Defining skills or learning in these ways is a very recent development. It is interesting to note how this report integrates skills from across several traditional school domains: math, science, computer science, engineering, and communication. It is also interesting to note how these skills are tightly embedded in task domains–doing things with people, machines, or data, and not just knowing facts. Thinking about necessary worker skills in such broad, inclusive terms forces us to reconceptualize the cross-disciplinary thrusts of our courses and our programs of study within universities. It forces us to consider to what extent our programs are content based vs. performance based.

Personal Development Skills

Increasingly, one of the themes of workplace literacy is that we need workers with well defined senses of self–people with high self-esteem, high motivation, and the ability to set high goals. Additionally, we need people with leadership skills and the ability to work effectively within organizations. Such people will recognize how they fit into organizations and how they can promote both individual and organizational goals.

Alongside this demand is a parallel demand for people who know how to learn. The ruling assumption is that most knowledge has a very short half-life. What people learn in school might carry them a short distance, but new jobs, new technologies, and new patterns of work organization quickly make obsolete what people learn in school. So the emerging model is one of constant learning in the workplace: constant training and constant adaptation to change.

The question for universities and for our own departments is clear–to what extent do we develop in students both self-motivation and the ability to learn in self-directed ways? Conversely, to what extent do our courses and our programs establish requirements that students must fulfill while encouraging them to be passive consumers?

Coda

There is an interesting cultural shift reflected in the calls for improved workforce literacy. In particular, they represent what many would construe as a somewhat conservative agenda: If there is a consensus, it is among those with vested interests–the business/industrial complex. When business or industry makes demands on the schools, many teachers become uncomfortable. They object that schools and universities are not trade or vocational schools, that they have larger missions related to the whole lives of their students, and not just to preparation for work.

And yet the current goals and the ways of talking about the goals could easily be construed as reflecting an earlier liberal/pragmatic agenda. The emphases on doing, on problem solving, on teamwork, and on project-based learning all sound a lot like an earlier Deweyan agenda for the schools. That earlier agenda was, like the current one, a response to arid, formalist instruction that was seen to be inadequate to the needs of a literate citizenry. It is ironic that what appeared liberal in the thirties now looks conservative in the nineties. I am not sure what to make of this appropriation of liberal educational theory by vested conservative interests, but I think it is worth noting.

Lest anyone assume that I think the path toward enhanced workplace literacy is clear, I would end on a note of caution. Suppose, for example, that we did attempt to give greater attention to oral skills in the workplace. The question still remains: "What oral skills? On what model?" We shouldn't assume that there is agreement on issues of what constitutes good communication. Gender studies, in particular, point up the essential underlying fact of variation in styles. Should we teach verbal dueling in an aggressive, "masculine" style? Should we teach compromise and concession, or hardball negotiation? Should we teach people to be open and non-defensive, to show concern and caring, or should we teach people to be crafty and calculating, with an eye on their rear flanks?

And what should we think about the issue of work ethic, the issue that business repeatedly stresses as so important? Are we close to agreement on what a good work ethic is? What happens as we move across the boundaries of social class and ethnicity? We would be mistaken if we assumed that there is a single, unifying work ethic that we need to develop in our students. We would inevitably do damage to some of the many cultures that together define American society. Many of the models that business is so enamored of derive directly from a foreign culture–from Japan–and it is important to maintain a healthy skepticism about expecting or even wanting the same levels of fierce corporate loyalty or commitment to work among workers in this country. We are just beginning to understand the trade-offs inherent in a Japanese model–the gender inequities, the psychological malaise, or the distorted value systems that follow from workers who have unquestioning loyalty and devotion to their companies.

I don't have the answers to some troubling questions. Yet I feel our teaching and our programs can only be better informed if we take into account the calls for enhancing workforce literacy. We need to participate in the dialogues that are today defining what a good worker is, what education is appropriate for that worker, and how full literacy in a participatory democracy might be defined.

Works Cited

Carnevale, Anthony, Leila J. Gainer, and Ann S. Meltzer. *Workplace Basics: The Essential Skills Employers Want*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Johnson, William B., and Arnold Packer. *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century*. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute, 1987. (available from U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402)

National Center on Education and the Economy. *America's Choice: high skills or low wages*. The Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. June 1990. National Center on Education and the Economy, 39 State Street, Suite 500, Rochester, NY 14614 (716/546-7620).

Natriello, Gary. *What Do Employers Want in Entry-Level Workers?* ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education: ED 308 279. 1989.

U.S. Department of Education. *America 2000: An Education Strategy*. Washington, D.C. U.S.: Department of Education, 1991. (1-800-USA-LEARN).

U.S. Department of Labor. *What Work Requires of Schools: A SCANS Report for America 2000*. U.S. Department of Labor, Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. June 1991.

U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Education. *The Bottom Line: Basic Skills in the Workplace*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

Appendix 1: What Work Requires of Schools

Reported in *What Work Requires of Schools: A SCANS Report for America 2000*. U.S. Department of Labor, Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. June 1991.

Workplace Know-how

The know-how identified by SCANS is made up of five competencies and a three-part foundation of skills and personal qualities that are needed for solid job performance. These include:

COMPETENCIES–effective workers can productively use:

- **Resources**–allocating time, money, materials, space, and staff;
- **Interpersonal Skills**–working on teams, teaching others, serving customers, leading, negotiating, and working well with people from culturally diverse backgrounds;
- **Information**–acquiring and evaluating data, organizing and maintaining files, interpreting and communicating, and using computers to process information;
- **Systems**–understanding social, organizational, and technological systems, monitoring and correcting performance, and designing or improving systems;
- **Technology**–selecting equipment and tools, applying technology to specific tasks, and maintaining and troubleshooting technologies.

THE FOUNDATION–competence requires:

- **Basic Skills**–reading, writing, arithmetic and mathematics, speaking, and listening;
- **Thinking Skills**–thinking creatively, making decisions, solving problems, seeing things in the mind's eye, knowing how to learn, and reasoning.
- **Personal Qualities**–individual responsibility, self-esteem, sociability, self-management, and integrity.

Appendix 2: Selected Objectives from America 2000

Reported from *America 2000: An Education Strategy*. U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. (1-800-USA-LEARN).

- By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
- The percentage of students who demonstrate the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively will increase substantially.
- The number of United States undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering, will increase substantially.
- Every major American business will be involved in strengthening the connection between education and work.
- All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocational, technical, workplace, or other programs.
- The proportion of those qualified students, especially minorities, who enter college; who complete at least two years; and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.
- The proportion of college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems will increase substantially.

Appendix 3: Recommendations from the National Center on Education and the Economy

Reported in *America's Choice: high skills or low wages!* The Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. June 1990. National Center on Education and the Economy, 39 State Street, Suite 500, Rochester, NY 14614. (716/546-7620).

1. A new educational performance standard should be set for all students, to be met by age 16. This standard should be established nationally and benchmarked to the highest in the world.
2. The states should take responsibility for assuring that virtually all students achieve the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Through the new local Employment and Training Boards, states, with federal assistance, should create and fund alternative learning environments for those who cannot attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery in regular schools.
3. A comprehensive system of Technical and Professional Certificates and associate's degrees should be created for the majority of our students and adult workers who no not pursue a baccalaureate degree.
4. All employers should be given incentives and assistance to invest in the further education and training of their workers and to pursue high productivity forms of work organization.
5. A system of Employment and Training Boards should be established by Federal and state government together with local leadership, to organize and oversee the new school-to-work transition programs and training systems we propose.

The choices America faces:

- Do we continue to define educational success as 'time in the he seat,' or choose a new system that focuses on the demonstrated achievement of high standards?
- Do we continue to provide little incentive for non-college bound students, or choose a system that will reward real effort with better pay and better jobs?
- Do we continue to turn our backs on America's school dropouts, or choose to take responsibility for educating them?
- Do we continue to provide unskilled workers for unskilled jobs, or train skilled workers and give companies incentives to deploy them in high performance work organizations?
- Do we continue in most companies to limit training to a select handful of managers and professionals, or choose to provide training to front-line workers as well?
- Do we cling to a public employment and training system fragmented by institutional barriers, muddled by overlapping bureaucracies and operating at the margins of the labor market, or do we choose a unified system that addresses itself to a majority of workers?
- Do we continue to remain indifferent to the low wage path being chosen by many companies, or do we provide incentives for high productivity choices?

Appendix 4: The Seven Skill Groups

Reported in Carnevale, et al. *Workplace Basics: The Essential Skills Employers Want.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Carnevale identifies seven skill groups, working up from a foundation of basic skills toward the more complex personal and interpersonal skills that characterize effective workers:

Organizational Effectiveness/Leadership

Interpersonal/Negotiation/Teamwork

Self-Esteem/Goal Setting-Motivation/Employability-Career Development

Creative Thinking/Problem Solving

Communication: Listening and Oral Communication

3 R's (Reading, Writing, and Computation)

Learning to Learn

THE "IS/OUGHT" TENSION IN TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Bob Johnson
Assistant Professor
Miami University of Ohio

During the ongoing development of any program in technical and scientific communication, there is always the pressure to keep a focus on what is happening in the communication worlds of industry and business. This is a good and necessary pressure. Academic programs in technical and scientific communication would be negligent and hypocritical if they failed to integrate the "is" of professional communication practices into their curriculum. Observational research conducted within business/industry settings; anecdotal evidence that is presented at conferences and other forums; and communication seminars developed by industry practitioners all provide important fodder for the development and continued growth of viable, practice-oriented technical and scientific communication programs.

Our programs would be equally negligent and hypocritical, however, if we failed to question (and indeed even resist) certain industry/business communication practices. Put another way, we should not unreflectively accept these industry/business communication practices and then place them into our curricula. We should, instead, be developing our programs with a constant eye toward the "ought" of technical and scientific communication practices. Consider the following two examples of the "is" in current communication practices within the computer industry to illustrate my point:

- *Online computer documentation should replace print.*

There is a strong movement in the computer industry to put all user documentation online. Online documentation certainly has its strengths -- it can be updated until software release; it is easily transportable; it is less expensive than print; it can include animation, sound and color. With the possible exception of the last point about animation, etc., these are all industry perceived benefits. Such benefits are concerned primarily with the economics of the software industry, and secondarily with the input of the technical communicator or documentation needs of the user. The software can be updated until the release, but the updates will be hastily done and without the benefit of any usability testing. (Also, easy updates might eventually mean fewer writers/designers are needed). It is easily transportable, but can only be used where a computer is available. It is less expensive to produce, but this is only true in the context of short term production costs, and not the long term losses that could occur if the software is unsuccessful in the marketplace due to poor documentation and training materials. In short, online documentation is useful, but not anytime, anywhere.

- *Usability evaluation and testing is good, but only if there is time.*

The evaluation of user needs and the testing of user documents are acknowledged by industry as valuable enterprises. Unfortunately, in actual practice the effort expended on the usability of products is minimal, and even then it is seldom integrated into the entire software development process. User evaluation, for example, is often done hastily and/or incompletely, and document testing is usually carried out late in the production process for the purpose of validating the correctness of the text, and not necessarily its usefulness for the user. Practices such as these diminish the importance of the technical communicator, but the burden of strengthening their role will rest on the shoulders of the technical communicators. Consequently, our programs are charged with the responsibility of preparing them to make these arguments and implement appropriate changes.

If we are committed to training technical and scientific communicators to have an impact in the industry/business world, then we should design our programs to enable them to affect change when and where it is needed. Professional communicators who can determine when and where the print medium is superior to online (and then persuade management of that determination) would be valuable assets for any company. In addition, professional communicators who can find usability problems early in the software development process would be equally valuable, and could actually be perceived by management as playing a role equal to that of the systems analysts -- as kind of throughout-the-process-user-debugging-specialists.

It should be mentioned here that the introduction of the "ought" into our curricula does not mean diminishing the importance of the "is". It is imperative that our students know how businesses operate and how to work within such environments, how to manage projects under time constraints, and how to be helpful members of development teams. It is equally important, however, that we give them the tools to design for change: to design for the "ought".

New Mexico Tech's Technical Communication Program: Introducing a Corporate Board

Lynn Deming
Associate Professor of English
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

Many things have contributed to the development of our technical communication (TC) program at New Mexico Tech, including student internships, alumni feedback, faculty involvement in professional societies as well as in consulting and training, professional journals and conferences, and a corporate board. Implementing a corporate board is our newest endeavor, and it has been very useful to our program.

We established a corporate board last year. Our purpose was twofold: to receive advice from objective, knowledgeable corporate managers who are or have been or employ technical communicators; and to receive financial support in the form of equipment and/or grants. So far, we have received some very worthwhile advice, but no financial support. My purpose in discussing the development of our TC program and our corporate board is not to complain about the lack of financial support we have received but to reveal how our program has changed and how the corporate board's advice has helped us review and develop our TC program.

Simply by their need fully to understand our program, our corporate board members forced us to reexamine our curriculum; to sharpen our vision of our TC program; and to update the language we use in describing our program, courses, and instructional techniques. For example, one of our board members, after reviewing the manuscript for the 1991-92 The Guide to the Technical Communication Program (produced by students in the instructional writing class), wrote

> It seems that your program is fairly traditional in that the core courses focus on writing. Our discipline used to be called Technical Writing; today it is called Technical Communication because of the changing focus. Today graphics, layout, desktop publishing, high-resolution computer displays, online help and documentation, usability testing, CBT*, human factors engineering, increased computer power and storage capacity, and a host of other factors bear on how we work on a daily basis.

What this said to those of us who teach in the TC program is that the Guide obviously did not accurately describe our program because our students do indeed learn about all the subjects this board member mentions. Consequently, we reexamined the Guide, rethought and rewrote several passages in it, and recognized that while we are keeping our students abreast of current changes in the work of a technical communicator, we were clearly not communicating this to the audience of the Guide--students primarily, but we also give copies of the Guide to professionals who enquire about our program or hire our interns or are prospective employers of our graduates.

---

*computer-based training

Another result of this reexamination was our recognition of the need for another kind of document, one that would describe our program for corporations, companies, and laboratories--for those prospective employers and for board members--a public relations brochure. This semester the students in the persuasive writing class have undertaken that task. We hope to have an appropriate brochure ready by the fall of 1992.

These are just a couple of examples of the kind of help our corporate board has given us. Thanks to the board, we reviewed and reassessed our TC program and traced its development, clarifying the progress we have made. Very briefly, New Mexico Tech's TC program began in 1982 and produced its first graduates (seven) in 1985. While the number of graduates varies each year, to date the program has graduated fifty students. When I arrived at New Mexico Tech in 1988, the curriculum for the TC program included 14 courses. Currently, the curriculum includes 19 courses and will include at least 21 courses in 1992. Not all these courses are, of course, required--eight are. At least one more course will be required in 1992. The new courses offer students in-depth instruction in graphics and document design, newsletter production (last year, students won a national STC Award of Achievement for the newsletter), language theory and history of the English language, advanced grammar, and employment preparation. Each of these courses is the result both of student interest and need and of marketplace demand.

Our corporate board adds another dimension to our program by providing us with objective feedback from the marketplace--from potential employers of our graduates. I would encourage other TC programs to establish a corporate board, if they haven't done so already. The advice, contacts, and support are invaluable to a dynamic, up-to-date program and to the students in that program.

Articulating Goals for A University/Corporate Advisory Board

Deborah S. Bosley
Assistant Professor of English
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

As a university or department begins to work toward developing a technical communication program, whether it be a concentration, a minor, a major, or a graduate program, the success of the venture may depend on securing the aid of members of the corporate community. We discovered that building a strong Advisory Board was an important step in securing practitioners' expertise; in responding to corporate expectations for today's technical communicators; in developing ties which could lead to research opportunities; and in securing corporate support for the new program.

In initiating such an Advisory Board, we determined that each board member should meet one or more of the following criteria: 1) be a technical writer or editor; 2) be familiar with, or responsible for, hiring technical communicators; 3) represent diverse professional fields; and 4) represent a range of professional abilities. Therefore, we created an Advisory Board which represented diverse corporate discourse communities as well as a broad range of professional abilities.

One of the first responsibilities for our Advisory Board was to develop a set of goals. We had to be clear on what we all wanted to achieve from this alliance: what advantages were to be gained both for the institution and for those industries involved in such an alliance. Thus, we collectively articulated the following goals (see Appendix for more specific details):

1) to design a technical communication program responsive to corporate as well as institutional and professional expectations;
2) to gain insight into the demands and constraints of technical communicators in industry;
3) to create situations in which both industry and academia would learn more about writing in the workplace;
4) to develop ties with industry which might enable us to conduct research in nonacademic writing communities; and
5) to build corporate support through a sense of ownership and financial responsibility to the developing program.

Institutional, Professional, and Corporate Expectations

One of the first goals we established for ourselves was to assess the concomitant needs and expectations of both academia and industry for a technical communication program. We examined a number of other technical communication programs and had a sense of what the technical communication academic community expected of its graduate, despite the fact that there certainly appeared to be no consensus among institutions. What the corporate community expected of new technical communicators was even more ambiguous.

In order to assess such expectations, the Board developed a questionnaire which was sent to approximately 200 corporations in the Charlotte area. In addition, the Board's input was invaluable in giving us suggestions for specific courses and for specific student skills. For instance, all Board members insisted that a comprehensive program in technical communication should include coursework in rhetorical theory both at the introductory and the advanced level.

The Board also articulated several of our concerns about such ties between industry and academia. They were adamant that this program not become merely an "arm" of corporate training, and they felt it was vital for students to understand linguistic, philosophical, and political differences in discourse communities represented in the corporate environment. Perhaps because so many of the members had been English majors during their college years or perhaps because they still retained a sense of what a liberal education was all about, each supported our contention that our technical communication program would be responsive to the goals of higher education. Thus many of our early discussions included articulating and challenging the epistomological assumptions of both the academic and the corporate community.

In addition to helping us design our minor, the board is currently discussing two outreach programs: 1) a series of courses offered to members of the corporate community through our continuing education program; and 2) a conference co-sponsored by UNCC and our local STC chapter.

Insight into a Corporate Environment

In addition to assessing expectations, we also reasoned that we needed to create a situation in which faculty members could learn more about a corporate environment. Because technical communication programs are relatively new, many teachers come from either a literature or a rhetoric background often having little or no training or experience in the technologies. Even those programs which train teachers of technical communication do not necessarily require that their graduates take courses in the technologies. Thus, gaining first-hand experience with the processes, products, and technical environments in industry is an important step in designing and staffing a technical communication program. An advisory board can be particularly important in helping faculty gain such necessary experience by offering opportunities for faculty to work (or do research) in technical environments.

We spent two months at IBM Charlotte in the summer of 1990 working as full-time technical writers during which time we 1) conducted research on team writing; 2) presented several writing seminars to members of the information development staff; 3) wrote and edited technical documents; and 4) prepared and presented a report to information development managers in which we outlined our experiences, observations, and recommendations. After this experience, we were better prepared to appreciate and understand one of the working environments of technical communicators. Other board members have expressed an interest in our "shadowing" their writers or working and doing research in their companies.

The Advisory Board has been extremely responsive in helping us become more technologically literate. Thus, goals 2, 3, and 4 were attained through the unique opportunity offered to us by the IBM board members. We strongly recommend securing this kind of experience for technical communication faculty.

Gaining Access to Corporate Support

Finally, developing a technologically responsive program demands state-of-the art computers and software: expensive outlays particularly for English departments where traditionally institutional financial support sufficed. Corporate advisory board members, we reasoned, might come to experience a sense of ownership and a greater responsibility toward a technical communication program which they helped to design. This sense of ownership not only enables us to find resources and expertise for obtaining needed equipment, but also allows us to develop a program responsive both to the goals of higher education and to the goals of educating technologically literate communicators. These goals were influenced by two events.

First, one of the board members assessed our current computing equipment and made recommendations to upgrade our facilities. These recommendations were passed on to the Chair of the English Department and the Dean of Arts and Sciences. We believe that recommendations coming from corporate board members carry more weight than if they come solely from faculty.

Secondly, the same board member approached the board with the idea of writing a grant to AT&T for computer equipment. Acting as a liaison between faculty and AT&T, he invited an AT&T representative to meet with the board and to discuss such a grant. Not only did we get feedback from the board members about such support, but a board member from another corporation decided to use AT&T's interest to spur her company into giving us support in the way of library holdings, software, and faculty development.

Many of the goals we set for ourselves we have achieved. Many are ongoing such as developing additional internship sites and researching additional funding. Certainly the most interesting goal for our advisory board is developing in all members a broader understanding of the epistomological systems in which both technical communicators and academics work: we have discovered that despite the differences in expectations and environments, we share more common political concerns than, at first, we assumed.

Goals for UNCC Technocal Communciation Advisory Board

(C) = completed goal (O) = ongoing goal

1. To design a technical communication program responsive to institutional, professional, and corporate expectations:

* researched existing programs (C)
* surveyed regional corporations (C)
* articulate curriculum and corporate philosophy (O)
* develop graduate and undergraduate courses
* prepared technical communication minor proposal (C)
* design continuing education courses (O)
* create professional conference (O)

2. To gain insight into the demands and constraints of technical communicators in industry:

* participated in an IBM Scholars-in-Residence session (C)
* invited to visit other worksites (O)

3. To create situations in which both industry and academia would learn more about writing in the workplace:

* presented IBM teleconference on technical writing (C)
* taught IBM writing seminars to technical communicators (C)
* presented panel discussion by members of Advisory Board (C)
* develop internship sites (O)

4. To develop ties with industry which would enable us to conduct research in nonacademic writing communities:

* participated in IBM Scholars-in-Residence session (C)
* conducted ethnographic research (C)
* wrote IBM management report (C)
* presented preliminary results of research at conferences (O)

5. To build corporate support through a sense of ownership and financial responsibility to developing program:

* initiate AT&T grant (O)
* investigate IBM resources (O)
* create plan for finding additional resources (O)

Benefits of a Review and Rating System

Chris Velotta
Senior Technical Publication Specialist
NCR Corporation

In many organizations, technical communicators are striving to demonstrate to employers and coworkers that they are members of an established profession. One way to support this assertion is to point out that our jobs require specific skills and a formal education program. Some form of certification, accreditation, or other formal review and rating of technical communication programs at the university level would go a long way toward supporting our claim to professional status.

In addition to enhancing the status of technical communication as a profession, there are two very practical benefits that I see coming out of program reviews. The first is a recruiting benefit to industry, and the second is a placement benefit to universities. I will limit the scope of this discussion to these two benefits. I know there are many legal, ethical, and logistics issues involved in evaluating programs; however, I will not address the debate over whether programs should be certified or accredited and by whom. These are important issues that must be resolved, but they are outside the realm of what I can cover here.

The recruiting benefit I see in program reviews stems from the fact that many personnel departments rate universities. They often provide guidelines on where managers may recruit new college graduates. Unfortunately, these ratings generally assess the entire institution and do not evaluate specific departments or programs. As a result, information product managers are sometimes discouraged from recruiting at some excellent technical communication programs because they are in universities that received a low overall rating.

Any department, such as engineering or information product development, that wants to rate an individual program must do the evaluation itself and must provide justification for rating the program higher than the overall university rating. A standard review and rating system applied to all technical communication programs would provide managers with support to help them protect their ability to recruit from the best programs. It would also allow managers to more accurately compare programs to find the one that best meets the recruiting needs of their departments.

The placement benefit I see in program reviews is related to the increasingly tight hiring forecasts for new college graduates. I see a definite trend toward shrinking work forces to eliminate duplication of effort and contain costs. As a result, many companies are retraining and transferring existing workers to fill openings instead of hiring new college graduates. To justify hiring a new college graduate, even if it is to keep up with attrition, many managers will have to justify the benefit to the company of bringing in another person as opposed to retraining and transferring someone from a department that is downsizing.

In addition to transferring people, the focus is increasingly on training existing employees to keep up with new developments in the field, such as hypermedia or SGML, rather than on acquiring these skills by hiring new college graduates. I believe that technical communication programs will experience increasing difficulty in placing their students.

One way to adjust to this changing environment is to have formal program reviews and ratings. This system would provide information product managers with a way to justify the hiring of new college graduates. It would help managers show that a specific program could meet specific personnel requirements, as certified by an independent evaluator. As a result, it is likely that technical communication programs would find a larger market for their graduates.

For these reasons, I support the adoption of a formal review and rating system for technical communication programs. I hope that the current debate over this issue results in a system that protects the rights of technical communication programs to control their own development and provides the support needed for industry and academia to work as partners in a changing market.

Views from the Trenches: Case Studies in Progress

Assessing Program Self-Assessment: A View From The Trenches

Carol S. Lipson
Deputy Director, Writing Program
Syracuse University

In the summer of 1991, I submitted a position statement for the CPTSC conference arguing for program self-assessment as a moral imperative. That is, the argument suggests that we have an obligation to do with our own efforts and activities what we are asking students to do with theirs. We now expect students to develop skills in peer and self-assessment, to reflect on the process and context of their communications, to revise their work in response to such evaluations, and to develop publication-quality finished products. And because we believe in the productivity of collaboration, we ask our students to engage collaboratively in intensive assessment of their work. As individual teachers, I believe we each subject our teaching efforts to intensive scrutiny. And as program leaders, I'm sure many regularly analyze individually their program's efforts and plans. What we do not do regularly is to submit our programs to a wide-scale collaborative assessment -- one involving all of our colleagues in the program, our present and former students, our administrations, and our faculty colleagues across the campus.

There are good reasons for this, of course. We're all very busy; many of us are truly overloaded. We're often too busy just trying to get the thing done to be able to back up and take the time to assess what it is we're really doing and how we're doing it. We're too busy trying to juggle the demands of research productivity, teaching, and program administration to be able to devote time to an additional service requirement: gathering assessment data. So how can I suggest that we ought to be doing more?

And yet I do advocate that we ought to be doing more, and that our own programs, our teachers, our students, our colleagues, and our fields will all benefit. So little is known yet about how students develop as communicators over time, and about the various ways we can link our plans with students' experiences outside our courses to best enhance that development. So little is known about how to evaluate a program's nurturing of student writers over time.

These questions need investigation, and our own self-assessments can contribute significantly to the understanding of how programs work in their special environments for their special students, and of how one can best assess such a necessarily contextualized functioning of technical communication programs. Without such understandings, program planning takes place in the dark, often applying models from the contexts of other schools, which may not quite fit the situated dimensions of the new program. Without any such understandings of the general principles underlying program design and development, each new program administration is in a position of having to reinvent the wheel. And we all know of programs whose parameters seem unsuitable, perhaps unworthy of the degree offered. But without increased fundamental understanding of how programs work, we cannot be in a position to develop particularly meaningful guidelines or standards that we can set forth with any high degree of confidence.

So I believe strongly that we should do what we are asking our students to do. We have students engage in collaborative assessment of their work, based on careful consideration of the process and context of that work. We ask students to substantially revise their work accordingly, and to bring their efforts to publishable stages. I am suggesting we enact on the program level the principles we ask students to enact in our courses. But I am also suggesting that we save ourselves from overload by conflating our research obligations with our program leadership obligations -- by undertaking such collaborative assessment in a spirit of inquiry, and by publishing our findings for the benefit of other program leaders and teachers.

In order to provide a better sense of what such a self-assessment might entail, let me offer a brief sketch of one such program's attempt. This is not an isolated technical communication self-assessment. I made the decision some years ago at Syracuse to bring technical writing under the rubric of the large new, general writing studies program which was charged with the mission of creating a sequence of four courses across the four years of an undergraduate degree, staged in a way that made sense developmentally for the growth of student writers. It seemed reasonable to me and to our other faculty to position technical writing as the last course in the sequence -- as the senior year course that examines and practices the rhetoric of professional and technical communication, primarily in workplace environments.

That placement of technical communication as one of four studios in a newly developed sequence, in a unified writing program, has consequences for any self-assessment of the technical-writing teaching, because we can't just be looking at an isolated unit. We can't just examine how the technical-writing studio course, and the follow-up advanced elective course and the follow-up internship course together prepare students for positions or improve their communication abilities. The 400-level studio, concentrating in technical and professional writing, is an integrated part of a staged unit, and the self-assessment we're doing now focuses on the entire unit: the four stages of writing instruction -- one for each undergraduate year -- that we have created in our program. That is, technical communication is no longer isolated as a separate entity, but is now part of a larger whole. My own feeling is that the technical writing teachers and students have benefitted from that connection, though it has brought some complications and some difficulties for technical writing teachers and students. That's my gut feeling. The self-assessment will give a much closer sense of whether or not the teachers, students, and faculty colleagues in other disciplines agree.

We're doing the self-assessment this year because we built it into our plan in 1986, when the program was established and its charter developed. We said then that we would conduct an intensive self-assessment after the fifth year of teaching the new courses. We also agreed that the university would bring in outside evaluators immediately after our self-assessment. This is now that fifth year, but there's a catch. Since we had four new courses to put in place, each following in sequence upon understandings and practices developed in the previous ones, we put the new courses in place in that order. In Fall 1987, we started the Freshman Studio. We got to implement the 300 and 400-level studios in 1990-1991. So the new technical writing course, which is placed at the 400-level and which builds on the work of the lower-level courses, has been in place only a year, though lots of the teachers have been experimenting and working towards it for several years.

Clearly this time frame limits the kinds of information we can get about the technical writing courses. We can't go to employers and get information on any but the recent graduates. Those graduates themselves have only been at work a few months; they're thus limited in the feedback they can offer. So our information collection on the technical communication component is significantly impaired by the time frame, and the focus of the self-assessment will more likely give more attention to the beginning writing studios. For one thing, they affect far more students. They're required of all students at the university, whereas the technical communication studios are required by a limited number of colleges and programs.

But we're preparing for the next stage of self-assessment. We've begun working with students in about 17 sections of our freshman course. We're going to track their writing and reading experiences as they progress through their undergraduate years, and for six years beyond. Not all of the approximately 350 freshmen now involved will stay with the project, which will offer extra credit each year for students to conduct ethnographies and develop analyses of the reading and writing experiences in their fields. We will publish the analyses at regular intervals over the ten-year period: after the sophomore year, after the junior year, after the senior year, and after five years beyond college.

Thus there's much that we can't do now, but there's also much that we can and will do to assess ourselves. First, we're doing lots of studies. Faculty are pairing with part-time instructors to study archival materials. For example, we have narrative student evaluations from 1987 to now, and one faculty/instructor pair will read all of them, analyze a selected portion, and see what the implications are. Similarly, we have year-end reflective statements from each of the approximately 120 teachers from 1987 to now, and we're examining those to see what they have to say about our efforts. We're seeking to determine how the demand for change affected the teachers, and how the plans for change and the support for change appeared from the teachers' perspective.

Another faculty/instructor pair is examining the five years of syllabi we have collected. A trio is examining the history of our efforts to introduce computing in our courses. We'll also be examining the history and status of material conditions -- such as the state of the base budgets, salaries, benefits, support staff, space allocations and configurations, access to equipment, and particularly the ability to hire and retain a stable cadre of teachers.

You can see that our writing program is busy writing. The self-study analyses we're doing are simultaneously summative and formative in focus, as well as scholarly. For instance, the analysis of teachers' reflective statements attempts not only to determine whether we handled the change appropriately to support the teachers' needs, but also to understand how the teachers took up the new demands, including the new reflective-statement genres, the new practices, even the new values. It's turning out that a Bakhtinian framework is proving immensely useful to explain the heteroglossia of voices we see in individual teachers' reflective statements, and to explain the mixing of genres that we find. And I'd even be willing to claim now that we see similar dialogic mixing of voices in the students' evaluation forms -- those that ask for narrative statements. Maybe all of this self-study work can help explain more than just what's happening in our own program's texts by teachers and students, and in our own program as teachers and students experienced a shift in courses. This work also might prove more generally applicable to explain student evaluations and teacher analyses as complex, dynamic, and dialogic texts.

In addition to these written texts, our campus testing-services group is arranging focus groups consisting of students, faculty, and an evaluation expert who get together to talk about the students' experiences in our courses. The campus testing services people will arrange many such groups for each of our studios. They will take the notes and write them up. They'll arrange focus groups consisting of teachers in the program who want to discuss their experiences over the five-year period. Administrators across the campus are writing official responses to all of these materials, from their own perspectives. And our Dean will bring in outside evaluators in the spring, scheduled for April. That's the plan, and it's moving along, though the faculty are drowning in work right now in attempting to get the stuff done. One bright light at the end of the tunnel is the fact that we may get some publications out of this work. A university press series has expressed interest in publishing the collection of analyses we produce.

One thing we didn't anticipate was the new financial exigencies affecting private universities. We depend on tuition, and have suffered a drop in enrollment and a loss of income. As with most other private colleges, our school is having to shrink in size and in budget. When money gets tight, all kinds of contentiousness come out of the woodwork, and our campus is certainly seeing its share of ugly infighting. We've been told we're fortunate to have arranged for an evaluation in advance, because outside evaluators always press for increased funds. Preliminary pseudoevaluations by outside experts have given considerable praise to our program's efforts and activities, so we should be able to get strong reviews now in this year's outside evaluation. The administration would likely not have approved a request this year for official outside evaluations for a program unless there's advice needed for restructuring and changing that unit substantially. Because we built the self-assessment and outside assessment in from the beginning as an explicit part of what we want to happen on a regular basis, we've got approval to go ahead. Several high-level administrators have advised that we should benefit by it all. That remains to be seen.

But we also know that other units on campus are trying to absorb our resources. They are trying to argue that their budgets shouldn't be slashed. Their party line goes like this: "Save the money instead by getting rid of the writing courses. Students make mistakes anyway after taking the courses, so you may as well not spend the money there." One leading voice pronouncing this position is a Dean of the Communications school. The other is a conservative English professor who believes all writing courses should be teaching appreciation of literature. So the two of them have organized a campaign to piggyback on our self-assessment and outside assessment. They want to bring in their own evaluators; they don't trust the Dean of Arts and Sciences to choose the right people -- people who care enough about grammar and about the teaching of literature. You can imagine what these folks, and any evaluators they'd bring in, would have to say about the value of a technical writing program. The two antagonists formed an ad-hoc committee that asked us to supply sets of graded student papers for them to analyze. We supplied them with materials by Ed White and others to defend the position that evaluating the quality and grading of student texts was a limited, problematic, and even bankrupt way to evaluate a program. Enough evaluation experts dumped on that approach to evaluating a program that they've backed off of that demand for the short term. It may surface again.

This wonderfully friendly ad-hoc investigating group is still asking to see student texts; they've gotten themselves officially enough constituted that we have to cooperate with them. So our self-assessment and outside evaluation is turning out to have a third component -- a hostile one. At least the Vice President for Undergraduate Studies insisted that they add others to their group, and the others so appointed are more open-minded.

Our self-assessment is thus a mixed blessing, since it's creating an enormous amount of work and it allowed a degree of credibility to this hostile group. The entire university faculty has been invited to make proposals to the new chancellor to save $28 million over the next four years. Every academic unit wants the cuts to come from somewhere else. Writing programs are always convenient targets in such situations, and we've become the target for such a proposal. I don't think the hostile group will get far with this initiative. And a program doing a self-assessment and an outside evaluation has to be able to take the flak with the praise, the ugliness with the benefits. Yet there's no question that the interactions with these hostile souls are emotionally draining and demanding on our time.

That 's the view from the upstate New York trench. It's a fair question to ask if I still stand behind my initial position -- the moral imperative for programs to conduct self-assessments. The answer is still a very strong yes. I still believe in the benefits of self-assessment, though it's going to leave me with many sleepless nights until I get my portions of the self-study done to my satisfaction. In the current financial environment at many schools, a self-assessment could clearly prove somewhat dangerous, as our own experience shows. And if we went into this process from a weak position, we might certainly be in trouble. But we're convinced that isn't the case. Certainly, we're learning a lot even at this early stage in the process. This self-study is proving eminently heuristic and generative. It's already leading to interesting new initiatives, and even some new resources. And it's creating a closer sense of community among the participants, which is significant in itself. We're in the trenches right now -- trenches are never pleasant places to be, but neither are they intrinsically bad places to be. Trenches have their own promise.

If It Isn't Broken, Why Fix It?
Ongoing Development of an Established Program

Gloria Jaffe
Assistant Professor of English
University of Central Florida

A good established Technical Communication program reflects years of planning, and then instigation of those plans. Often, the planning stops with the establishment of that program. "If it isn't broken, why fix it?" should not be the byword of professionals in our field. Generation and implementation of new ideas is mandatory for a good technical communication program to become a great program. Our profession demands that we be aware of what is being produced in our literature and in the work place. It is necessary to revise existing courses, delete outdated and unnecessary courses, and create new courses that reflect the advances in the profession. We must not allow our programs to become stagnant.

How do we go about preventing this stagnation?

First, as program directors, we need to be involved in many different professional organizations so that we are aware of what is happening in the work place and in academe. We need to read all related information in our professional journals and in appropriate magazines. We need to share ideas and information with our colleagues by attending conferences and participating in those conferences. We need to share ideas and information by writing and publishing information that we have discovered through research and practice.

Second, individual programs need to subject themselves to frequent self review, to evaluate their status, using criteria established through the above activities. These self reviews can encourage faculty to be innovative in their teaching, and responsive to new ideas in their research. In addition, it is the responsibility of the program director and program faculty to make administrators aware of this need to make changes in programs. Of course, changes in programs often mean changes in faculty strength, creating the need for new faculty. It is the program director's responsibility to make administrators aware of this need, also.

Review and reconstruction were the first areas that we considered at UCF as we began planning a Master's Program in Technical Writing two years ago. In a sense, we conducted an in-house self review of our undergraduate program evaluating faculty; the faculty strengths; our present courses; our outside sources, including our Board of Advisors; the administrative support; and our technical support, including our laboratory, equipment, and staff.

This overview helped us to decide what we needed to change in our undergraduate program before we began our Master's program. For example, we had two courses in our undergraduate program, Technical Production and Graphics in Technical Writing, that we determined were redundant in their present form. To alleviate this situation, we reconstructed the Production course so that it introduced many of the Graphics topics, and created a 5000 level graduate course in Graphics that is more appropriate for the needs of our students as it will address theory and practice in a more detailed manner than did the undergraduate course. Placing the course at the 5000 level allows both graduate and undergraduate students to take the course as a restrictive elective.

We looked at each of our undergraduate courses in the same critical light. We canvassed our former students for their ideas about changing needs in the field as they were reflected in our present courses. We listened to their criticism, and added several courses to our Master's program: Editing; Teaching Technical Writing; Non-fiction Writing; and a Tools course that will change as the tools change that we use. This course, too, will be taught at the 5000 level for the convenience of our undergraduate and graduate students.

We asked our Board of Advisors to suggest courses that they considered important. Unanimously, they said that a Project Management course was vital. Even though we included project management in many of our undergraduate courses, we listened to these people who are working in industry in our profession, and created a Project Management course in our Graduate program with the help of two of the Board members.

These are just a few of the results of our self study. With the addition of the guidelines in CPTSC's Program Review, we will continue to review our programs and to change them as the need arises.

We have to be bold, willing to experiment with content and form in our good Technical Communication programs so that they will become great programs. Let's not be complacent. Let's "fix it before it gets broken."

Starting at the Beginning: Program Assessment as Part of Program Design

Meg Morgan
Assistant Professor of English
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

In the rush of program design, it's tempting to postpone program assessment until there is a full-blown program to assess. That, however, is a mistake. It makes more sense to consider criteria for assessing a program right from the beginning, in the midst of clear talk about its goals and effects, rather than later when such ideas become part of its day-to-day operation.

At UNC-Charlotte, we are at the end of 18 months of work designing a program in technical communication. Now, after the design is done but before it is fully implemented, we have begun planning how we will assess the program. To create a framework for assessment, we have considered our goals (Attachment 1) and our short and long range objectives (Attachment 2). We have used some ideas Witte and Faigley discuss in Evaluating College Writing Programs.

Four areas provide the framework for program assessment:

•The Charlotte Community

•The University Community

•The Department of English

•The Technical Communication Student

In order to assess the impact of the program on these four areas, we have established a procedure, which we call an "assessment plan," for each of the four areas. Each plan has three stages:

1. Gathering information from external sources to help establish evaluative criteria
2. Setting up criteria
3. Designing ways to measure whether or not the program meets the criteria.

At the present time, we are still refining the each of the plans. The rest of this paper describes this procedure in more detail.

The Charlotte Community

Because our goals statement affirms our commitment to the Charlotte community, we must assess the impact of our program on this community. Through our Technical Communication Community Advisory Board and a community needs assessment conducted in spring 1990, we know that the community wants a program that will prepare current and future employees as technical communication professionals and provide consulting and technical assistance.

The data-gathering method for our community-based assessment a plan will be interviews with members of the Charlotte community, especially those who responded to the 1990 needs assessment survey. We will investigate specific ways the program can respond to the community. For example, through these interviews, we may learn that the community wants our program to help raise the status of technical communicators. Based on this information, we will establish criteria and then ways to measure if the criteria are met. The effectiveness our program will depend on how well they are met. In addition, we know from the needs assessment that technical communicators in the workplace are interested in earning credit through a certificate program at the University. Our criteria for this area will include a timetable, goals, and guidelines for such a program then measuring our effectiveness against these criteria.

The University Community

Our program in technical communication will affect the university community. Because our program is interdisciplinary, enrollment in courses in other departments will be affected; because it admits students from throughout the university regardless of major, course loads for students may change; because we eventually want to consult with other departments to help them identify the writing needs of their own students, whether or not these students enter our technical communication program, attitudes towards writing may be affected.

In order to establish the criteria against which to measure the effects of our program on the university, our assessment plan will include interviews with faculty in professional disciplines to learn current faculty attitudes, including, for example, attitudes toward writing in general and the relationship between a technical communication program and technical students in particular. We will also seek written documentation, such as current enrollment in courses, to assess the impact of our program on enrollment in other disciplines. The criteria to measure the effect of our program on other disciplines and departments in the University will be based on our interviews within the university community.

The Department of English

Some of the goals of the program in relation to the Department of English include:

1. Providing ways to prepare English majors for a viable career
2. Securing grants for faculty and curriculum development, including upgrading the computer facilities in the Department and enhancing the library holdings in technical communication
3. Providing needed resources through additional FTE
4. Increasing the visibility of the Department in both the Charlotte and University communities

For each of these goals we need criteria and ways to measure. In addition, we also want to know the effect of the technical communication program on the number of English majors and on changes within the English curriculum.

The assessment plan for the Department of English will include various data-gathering surveys, one already completed. Last spring we surveyed over 250 English majors (approximately 60% of the total number) on their career plans. This spring we will survey all current English majors and will interview faculty on curriculum preferences. We will also survey those who have graduated in the past three years about their career decisions. In the future, we will, of course, monitor students who enter and graduate from our program.

From this data gathering, we will develop those criteria against which to measure the effects of a technical communication program on the career choices of English majors and on the curriculum of the Department.

The Technical Communication Student

Our major responsibility is to students who enter this program. For these students we must provide superior instruction, updated equipment, adequate supplies, prepared and motivated faculty, and careers at the end of the program. While the department has ways to assess competent teaching for its composition and literature courses, those of us designing this program need ways to assess teaching in technical communication as a separate experience, to provide adequate preparation for technical communication teachers, and to provide on-going faculty development opportunities for teachers. We must develop ways to evaluate student writing during and at the completion of the program and ways to follow up on our graduates once they have left the University.

Our data-gathering methods will focus on these two areas: the development of teacher effectiveness and the assessment of student performance. To develop criteria to measure teacher effectiveness, we will survey technical communication faculty in our program and in other technical communications programs.

In the area of student performance, we are especially interested in portfolio assessment of writing, not only at the completion of each course, but also at the end of the program. A portfolio approach will also provide students with writing samples they can show prospective employers. Data gathering will focus on interviewing those experienced in conducting portfolio assessment.

The effectiveness of our program will depend on revision in the light of changes within the technical communication profession. We must survey our students as they leave the program and on a regular basis thereafter so we can measure the relevance of our courses and instruction to experiences in the workplace.

Conclusion

Although this framework has been established, we still have serious work ahead. Some data-gathering has been done, but more is not. We are confident that when completed, the assessment plan approach will provide a model for other writing programs.

Works Cited

Witte, Stephen P. and Lester Faigley. Evaluating College Writing Programs. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

Attachment 1

Goals of the Technical Communication Program

The Technical Communication Program at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte will serve two communities: the academic community and the workplace community. In the academic community, the program will train undergraduate and graduate students to communicate technical information by building a thorough understanding of relevant empirical and theoretical research. In addition, students in the program will have the opportunity to apply what they learn through on-site work experiences (internships and co-op experiences). The program will meet the needs of those students who desire to work in a highly technical field by introducing them to the applications of technology to human communication.

Through this program, the University also will fulfill its role as an urban university by attending to the technical communication needs of the workplace community. This community will be able to meet continuing education requirements for its technical communication professionals through this program; the community will have at its disposal experts who can provide training assistance for employees in technical communication, who can provide research assistance in technical communication, and who can respond to community technical communication problems on an as-needed basis.

This interaction between the academic community and the workplace community will vitalize each. The University, its faculty, and its students will accrue experiences in a "real world" environment, opportunities to observe changes and to apply theoretical and empirical research outside the classroom. In addition to a wider pool of trained professional technical communicators from which to hire, the workplace community will also be able to understand changes in the field from the perspective of theory and research.

Attachment 2

Technical Communication Program: Short- and Long-Range Objectives

Fall 1991 - Spring 1995

End of	# Students in minor	# Tenurable faculty	Courses used/needed	Equipment Action	Outreach
Fall 1991	0	3	Intro to Theory	21 Macs 2 Printers	Clemson University CSTCP Marketing
Spring 1992	6	3	Intro to Theory Visual Design	21 Macs 2 Printers	Local talks Apple grant Plan Institute
Fall 1992	12	3	Intro to Theory User Doc.	21 Macs 2 Printers Network w/ Hard drives	Continuing Ed Institute (ongoing)
Spring 1993	20	3	Intro to Theory Tech. Editing Visual Design		Plan UNCC/ Corp Conference
Fall 1993	30	3	Intro to Theory User Doc.	IBM Lab	Conference
Spring 1994	36	3	Intro to Theory Tech. Editing Visual Design		
Fall 1994	40	4	Intro to Theory User Doc.		

Review, Certification, Accreditation-- Is It Time to Decide?

Accreditation:
Time to Act

Katherine Staples
Department Head, Technical Communications
Austin Community College

STC president David Armbruster's 1991 inaugural address called for better communication and cooperation between academia and STC. This call is a timely opportunity for programs in technical communication. After all, the last ten years have seen the growth and evolution of both the technical communications profession and academic programs which prepare students for it.

The growth of STC parallels the development of the technical communication profession. Once ill-paid ancillaries who received information only at the end of a project cycle, technical communicators are now respected members of development teams, and the information they create has become an important (and increasingly marketable) part of each new technical product. This change of status and responsibility is reflected in higher salaries, salaries which technical communicators earn with the growing range and depth of skills and knowledge they bring to the workplace. We are likewise seeing a wider range of career tracks in publication departments and in organizations, parallel promotions from communication areas to technical ones, and more opportunities for technical communicators to learn and grow on the job, as verbal and visual communicators, as managers, and as technicians.

We have seen a similar development in technical communications as an academic discipline. Here at CPTSC we have wrestled to define our own multidisciplinary area, to make rooms of our own. We have addressed problems of tenure and promotion, struggling to establish our own place in departments and in universities. We have tried --perhaps unsuccessfully-- to outline the meaning of certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs in our field. We have emerged from English and Engineering Departments to define our own multidisciplinary research areas separate from rhetoric and composition. We have arrived.

Our academic programs, like the technical communications profession, have come of age. It is therefore time for us to address goals we share with industry. All of us acknowledge diversity in the workplace as in our programs. Industry and academia both agree that student technical communicators must first of all learn to learn, updating for new technologies -- technologies which are both the subject and the means of written and visual communication. We all acknowledge the value of rhetorical study, particularly of ethics and persuasion, and of cognitive science. Most important, all of us want to see excellent graduates enter the technical communication profession and shape its future.

We differ with industry, however, about the best means to measure excellence in our graduates and in our programs. STC has long debated the issue of certification, but the debate has foundered over the growing diversity of duties and concomitantly diverse skills of technical communicators. STC has now voiced a similar interest in accreditation for academic programs. However, the diversity of our curriculum, our students, and our degrees will make accreditation impossible, and external accreditation a quantitative (not qualitative) measure of our work, one which cannot assure the excellence we all want.

STC's interest in accreditation makes academia and industry seem like the opposing sides of Snow's two cultures instead of shareholders in a common cause: quality education for the technical communicators of the future. In CPTSC we have defined our goals and programs in years of conversation among ourselves. Now it's time for us to communicate with groups and individuals outside our own organization. We must explain our academic needs and constraints --curricular, organizational, and administrative-- that differ from those of industry, if we are to enlist the support of STC in shared educational goals.

David Armbruster's call for communication and cooperation can be a promise for our programs and for our students if we respond to it in a positive and open way. We need to act on, not react to, the issue of accreditation if we are to shape our technical communication programs to meet each academic institution's individual goals. It's time for us to act --to lead, follow, or get out of the way.

A Case for Program Review, Not Certification

Sherry Burgus Little
Director of Composition Program Development
and Director of Technical Writing Program
San Diego State University

For those not familiar with the history of the program review activities of CPTSC, I would like to briefly give an overview of what has been happening for the past few years. At the annual meeting in Orlando, Florida, on October 9, 1987, Patrick Kelley, immediate past president of CPTSC, proposed that the past presidents of the CPTSC form an advisory board whose purpose would be to act as consultants and evaluators for those forming new programs and for those wishing an outside review of established programs in technical and scientific communication. "Sam Geonetta proposed that a standing committee of past presidents would, with the advice and consent of the Executive Committee, be responsible for coordinating evaluation, upon request, of proposed, new, and established programs in technical and scientific communication." (Jaffe, p. 139)

At the 1989 annual meeting in Rochester, New York, the Executive Committee proposed a Program Review Board (PRB). At this meeting "...people generally agreed that the PRB should not be put forth as a group that 'endorses' programs." (Pfeiffer, p. 2) A Planning Committee was elected to consider procedures and guidelines. This committee was directed to report to the Executive Committee in April 1990 and to report at the Annual Meeting in October 1990. This Committee, headed by Billie Wahlstrom, and including Mary Lay, Sherry Little, Henrietta Shirk, and Katherine Staples began developing a preliminary draft of a questionnaire.

The next year in San Diego, Billie Wahlstrom reported on the Committee's work and presented a comprehensive questionnaire the Committee had designed. At the meeting, the name of this Committee was changed to the Program Development Advisory Board, and the following three next steps were decided:

1. Membership of CPTSC should give feedback to questionnaire.
2. Designated representatives will work with STC, WPA, and other organizations for joint program review goals, including creating lists of people to help with reviews.
3. New Board will report to the Executive Committee who will decide the next appropriate step.

The Program Development Advisory Board, chaired by Henrietta Shirk, and including Sherry Little, Katherine Staples, and Maria Kreppel began work on these tasks.

At the Executive Committee meeting in Boston, in 1991, Henrietta Shirk reported that two forms had been developed, the long form for program review and a short form for gathering data about programs. It was decided to send out the long form only for membership review. It was also decided that creating a database about programs needed to be a joint effort with other organizations like STC so that there would be no duplication of effort and data gathering activities could be coordinated.

During this Executive Committee meeting the question was raised about CPTSC and STC forming a joint committee for certifying programs. The issue was then raised whether CPTSC wishes to be involved at all in certifying programs. It was decided that the "General concensus of the Executive Committee was that the function of program review was for self-study, not for accreditation or certification of programs." (Little, p. 1)

Clearly, since the beginning of CPTSC's interest in review, accrediting or selecting successful programs has not been a part of the idea. Some might argue that accrediting has certain advantages. It is argued, for example, that such accreditation standards can give directors clout with administrators when arguing for program resources, and it can enhance the professional image of technical communication. It can, as well, standardize programs. Certainly, if such an action is done, it must be a joint effort; but other, more serious concerns are the questions, "Who's going to do it? What are their guidelines?" And, of course, these questions identify the underlying disadvantages of accreditation or certification.

Certification demands that general descriptors, standards, common templates or models, be established to measure programs. Such visions of assessment raises the spector of what I call the "accountability mentality," the establishment of basic competences, the least common denominators types of guidelines. Creating minimum requirements for earning a seal of approval does not promote academic excellence, a goal I identify with CPTSC's efforts.

Thus, I argue that program review must be kept separate from certification programs. Program reviews afford a time for self-reflection and self-study, a periodic review and evaluation of goals and missions. These activities are more constructive in encouraging excellence in technical communication programs than are accreditation programs that establish lowest common denominator types of guidelines. The advantages attributed to certification can accrue from formal program reviews as well, as the record of the Council of Writing Program Administrators can attest. Administrators take such formal reports from reviewers quite seriously and such self-study is already an accepted part of the academic world's professional review and evaluation system.

The history of the idea for developing a system for program review supports program review rather than an accreditation system for academic programs. Program reviews, linked with those done by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), fit the original plans and goals of CPTSC more closely and represent the desires of earlier decisions of CPTSC than do recent discussions of accreditation or certification. CPTSC, then, should continue its plans for developing a program review for technical communication programs and should not become involved in a joint effort with STC to accredit programs. In fact, I urge CPTSC to take a stand in opposition to any assessment practice that would certify or accredit academic programs and in strong support of a self-study system, like that of WPA, that promotes academic excellence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jaffe, Gloria. Minutes, 14th Annual Meeting. _Proceedings 1987_. The Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication, Orlando, Florida, pp. 137-39.

Pfeiffer, W. S. Minutes, 16th Annual Meeting. _Proceedings 1989_. The Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication, Rochester New York, pp. 1-3.

Little, Sherry B. Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting March 20, 1991, Boston, Massachusetts.

18th Annual
Business Meeting

Agenda

Business Meeting

CPTSC, October 12, 1991

Call to Order
Old Business
  Minutes of the 1990 Annual Meeting
    Sherry Burgus Little, Secretary
  Treasurer's Report and Membership
    Laurie S. Hayes
  Report on Publications
    James Zappen
  Report on Publicity
    Dan Riordan
  Constitutional Amendment on Nominating Procedure
    Sam Geonetta
  Report on Program Development Advisory Committee
    Sherry Burgus Little

New Business
  Location, format, and theme of 1992 Annual Meeting

  Location of 1993 Annual Meeting

  Guide to Programs in Technical Communication

  Nominating Committee for Biennial Elections

> The Immediate Past President [Marilyn Samuels, this time] shall chair the nominating committee and shall appoint, in consultation with the executive committee, four additional members: one from the executive committee and three from general membership, and shall announce committee membership at the annual meeting preceding the elections.

  Other

  Announcements

CPTSC
EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
MINUTES
October 12, 1991
Cincinnati, Ohio

The meeting was called to order by President Sam Geonetta at 9:14 a.m. The minutes for the seventeenth annual meeting were approved.

Treasurer's Report

Laurie Hayes gave the treasurer's report. The membership list will now include e-mail addresses and brochures will have a blank for this address. Procedures for renewing membership will remain the same. Laurie Hayes announced that three proceedings were published in one year, but costs were kept low by publishing them ourselves. Also meetings now should keep within income so we will not be subsidizing costs, and plans are underway to increase membership. The treasurer's report was approved.

Membership Drive

The goal is to increase membership to a total of 100 members by next year. Ideas for accomplishing this goal included having the Secretary write letters to all programs not represented in CPTSC membership and to individuals no longer attending. With the goal to broaden the membership base, the Executive Committee was directed to rewrite the description of membership and change the word "administrators" to "representatives." The Executive Committee will also create a bulletin board announcement about CPTSC.

Publicity

Dan Riordan reported on the publicity efforts he has been making. He has expanded ads in journals, included ATTW in mailings, publicized CPTSC in the STC newsletter and other contact places. Gloria Jaffe suggested that brochures be distributed at regional meetings. Mary Coney suggested a CPTSC/ATTW connection. Also suggested were sending out newsletters to all programs, writing letters to two-year schools, and planning a 4C's workshop on how to form programs. Also mentioned was the special issue of CCC on promotion and tenure of technical communication teachers.

112

Publications

James Zappen reported on the publications of CPTSC. He announced the policy for ads and copy for the 1991 meeting for the papers of two pages or more. The deadline for the proceedings copy will be early January and publication should be early spring. He discussed plans for the newsletter and called for information to be published.

Constitutional Amendment

It was decided that a ballot be sent out immediately to be returned by December 1 and that the majority of those voting will decide the question about the constitutional amendment. It was also decided that the amendment should read "at least one candidate but not more than three candidates." Gloria Jaffe will write a rationale for the amendment. The letter will also encourage people interested in serving as candidates to let Marilyn Samuels know they are willing to be placed on the ballot.

Program Development Advisory Board Report

Sherry Little reported on the Program Development Advisory Board in the absence of chair Henrietta Shirk. It was decided that the document incorporate Mary Lay's findings from her study about benchmarks for quality. It was also decided that we formally thank Henrietta Shirk for her work in getting the documents completed.

1992 Annual Meeting Plans

It was decided that the 1992 meeting will be in Boise, Idaho, from October 8-10, 1992. The theme will be Academic/Industry/ Professional Connections, Cooperative Links with Industry: Broadening the Base of Technical Communication Programs. The format for the presentations will remain the same as that of this meeting with short position papers. Suggested locations for the 1993 meeting included Charlotte, Ann Arbor, and Las Cruces.

CPTSC/STC Joint Efforts

It was decided also that the data gathering portion of the final documents developed by the Program Development Advisory Board be used in a joint effort with the Society for Technical Communication with a joint publication and an electronic database as possible outcomes.

Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee, chaired by past-president Marilyn Samuels, includes Sam Geonetta, Stephen Bernhardt, Carol Lipson, and Mary Lay.

The meeting was adjourned temporarily until after lunch.

Program Review

After lunch, the meeting resumed where it was decided that the program review document developed by the Program Development Advisory Board be retained in its present form except that the changes from Mary Lay's study be included and that this document be made available through the proceedings.

It was decided also that the Executive Committee start developing ideas for implementing program review, to include training, legal implications, evaluators, fees, and guidelines, and that the Committee report to the next annual meeting of CPTSC their findings.

The following statements were endorsed by the membership of CPTSC:

1. CPTSC welcomes STC's offer to collaborate with CPTSC on educational issues and shares STC's concerns about quality in education.

2. CPTSC will establish direct and active communication links with STC.

3. CPTSC believes that the most valuable way to develop and support quality academic programs is through a flexible program review that considers programs relative to their own self-defined goals, not through an externally governed accreditation policy or procedure, which ranks or approves programs.

4. CPTSC is currently engaged in developing such a program review, one designed to provide programs with opportunities for reflective self-study.

Further, the members directed the CPTSC Executive Committee to write to the Board of STC expressing the following:

1. Grateful acceptance of STC's offer to work with CPTSC to promote quality in the profession.

2. Invitation to STC Board members to join CPTSC at its 1992 meeting to explore mutual cooperation and support.

3. A request that the STC Board urges and supports its local chapters to forge strong local ties (student chapters, research and training grants, advisory boards, and internships).

4. Endorsement of sliding fee scale for academics for STC membership fee and ITCC registration to enable academics to participate in STC

5. Information about the current initiatives of CPTSC: the directory and the review materials.

It was decided that Sam Geonetta will use the program review document, as revised, for gathering information at STC and we will work jointly with STC on creating information database about technical communication programs.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry Little

Sherry Burgus Little, Secretary

CPTSC Financial Report
September 30, 1990 to September 30, 1991

BALANCE FROM SEPTEMBER 30, 1990			$2486.24
CREDITS			
Interest on checking account (12/90 -9/91)		52.82	
Memberships -- 1990 (7 individuals)		140.00	
Memberships -- 1991 (58 individuals)		1160.00	
(1 corporation)		100.00	
Registrations -- 1990 Annual meeting		2343.00	
Sale of Proceedings		24.00	
total:		3819.82	+ $3819.82
DEBITS			
1990 Annual meeting			
hotel	2961.08		
miscellaneous	108.20	3069.28	
Stationery		347.50	
Newsletter -- Fall 1990			
printing	84.00		
labels	14.44		
postage	34.75	133.19	
Newsletter -- Spring 1991			
printing	102.00		
postage	46.40	148.40	
Proceedings -- 1988 and 1989			
printing (100/1988; 80/1989)	346.56		
envelopes	14.91		
postage	167.52	528.99	
Proceedings -- 1990			
printing (85)	399.00		
envelopes	10.64		
postage	113.88	532.52	
Renewal notices -- 1991		29.00	
Executive Committee meeting -- 1991		260.49	
Miscellaneous administrative expenses (bank charges, postage, labels)		58.53	
total:		5098.90	- $5098.90
BALANCE			$1207.16

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie S. Hayes

Laurie S. Hayes, Treasurer
October 12, 1991

Executive Committee Meetings

CPTSC
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
October 10, 1991
Cincinnati, Ohio

The meeting was called to order by President Sam Geonetta. Present were Marilyn Samuels, James Zappen, Sherry Little, Laurie Hayes, Dan Riordan, Karen Schriver, and Mary Coney.

Procedures for the presentations and role of moderators were established for tomorrow's program, with the decision that Sam Geonetta would announce procedures at the beginning.

The agenda for the business meeting was discussed. The background of the constitutional change was discussed in relation to the tasks of a nominating committee. Because there must be a mail ballot to change the constitution, no action can be taken until next year. Thus the ballot must contain at least two persons for each office. Past-president Marilyn Samuels will chair the nominating committee with Sam Geonetta serving as one of the other members. The Committee decided to discuss the issue of the amendment at the annual meeting and to encourage people to identify themselves as potential nominees. The Committee concurred that new people should be encouraged to volunteer.

President Sam Geonetta discussed membership of CPTSC. By studying old lists, he had identified about 200 or 300 people who have at one time or another been members, with a core of about 40 people who are constant. To increase membership, the Committee set the goal of a total membership of 100 people by next year.

Treasurer Laurie Hayes gave the Treasurer's report, raising financial questions about subsidizing costs for meetings. Because costs are going up, yet income remains about the same, she asked executive direction. The Committee agreed that meetings have to pay for themselves and that the proceedings and newsletters must be paid for.

The Committee also discussed how often it needs to meet and if it should meet more than once a year. Also discussed was the STC interest in accrediting academic programs. It was decided to continue the meeting after lunch on Saturday, October 12.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry Little

Sherry Burgus Little, Secretary

CPTSC
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
October 12, 1991

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. It was decided that Sam Geonetta will be the contact person for information that James Zappen will need for meeting information. Henrietta Shirk will contact James Zappen about the program review document. Dan Riordan will review the instructions for proceedings copy.

Laurie Hayes reported that some participants at the meeting had not paid, that the policy of helping defray Executive Committee members travel expenses will continue for those needing it, and that membership brochures need to be sent to James Zappen to include with newsletter. Sherry Little will send these brochures to him.

The Program Development Advisory Board will continue to address the task of implementing program review and report to the Executive Committee at the next annual meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry Little

Sherry Burgus Little, Secretary

Appendices

Appendix A

List of Conferees
To the Eighteenth Annual CPTSC Meeting

Paul Anderson
Miami Univ. (Ohio)
Dept. of English
Oxford, OH 45056

Stephen A. Bernhardt
New Mexico State University
Dept. of English
Box 3E

Deborah Bosley
Univ. of North Carolina
Dept. of English
Charlotte, NC 28223

Pam Brewer
Terra Technical College
2830 Napoleon Road
Fremont, OH 43420-9670

Mary Coney
Univ. of Washington
Dept. of Tech. Comm.
14 Loew Hall, FH-40
Seattle, WA 98195

Marilyn Cooper
Michigan Tech. Univ.
Dept. of Humanities
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, MI 49931-1295

Don Cunningham
Auburn Univ.
Dept. of English
9030 Haley Center
Auburn University, AL 36849-5203

Lynn Deming
New Mexico Tech.
Humanities Dept.
Socorro, NM 87801

Sandra Harner
Cedarville College
Box 601
Cedarville, OH 45314

Laurie Hayes
University of Minnesota
Dept. of Rhetoric
202 Haecker Hall
St. Paul, MN 48109-2108

Gloria Jaffe
Univ. of Central Florida
1910 Englewood Road
Winter Park, FL 32789

Robert Johnson
Miami Univ. (Ohio)
Dept. of English
Oxford, OH 45056

William Karis
Dept. of Tech. Comm.
Clarkson Univ.
Potsdam, NY 13676

Maria Kreppel
Univ. of Cincinnati
105A Adm, Bld., M.L. #631
Cincinnati, OH 45221

Tom Lang
Cleveland Clinic Foundation
Scientific Publications
One Clinic Center Drive
Cleveland, OH 44107

Mary Lay
Univ. of Minnesota
Dept. of Rhetoric
202 Haecker Hall
St. Paul, MN 55108

Anthony Flinn
Eastern Washington Univ.
Dept. of English
Mail Stop 25
Chency, WA 99004

Sam Geonetta
Univ. of Cincinnati
College of Applied Science
2220 Victory Parkway, M.L. #103
Cincinnati, OH 45206-2822

Meg Morgan
Univ. of North Carolina
Dept. of English
Charlotte, NC 28223

Chuck Nelson
Youngstown State Univ.
English Dept.
Youngstown, OH 44555

Leslie Olsen
Univ. of Michigan
Tech. Comm. Program
111 TIDAL, 2160 Bonisteel Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2108

Nancy O'Rourke
Utah State Univ.
Dept. of English
Logan, UT 84322-3200

Diana Reep
Univ. of Akron
Dept. of English
Akron, OH 44325-1906

Dan Riordan
Univ. of Wisconsin-Stout
1215 Wilson Ave.
Menomonie, WI 54751

Carolyn Rude
Texas Tech. Univ.
Dept. of English
lubbock, TX 79409-3091

Martha Sammons
Wright State Univ.
Dept. of English
Dayton, OH 45435

Carol Lipson
Syracuse Univ.
Writing Prgm., 239 HBC
Syracuse, NY 13244-1160

Sherry Little
San Diego State Univ.
2482 Valley Mill Road.
El Cajon, CA 92020

Marilyn Samuels
Case Western Reserve Univ.
Dept. of English, Guilford House
Cleveland, OH 44106

Karen Schriver
Carnegie-Mellon Univ.
5000 Forbes Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Barbara Smith
Alderson-Broaddus Coll.
Box 2158
Philippi, WV 26416

Katherine Staples
Austin Comm. Coll.
508 Park Blvd.
Austin, TX 78751

Freda Stohrer
Air Force Inst. Tech.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, OH 45433-6583

Elizabeth Turpin
Ferris State Univ.
19418 Golfview Drive
Big Rapids, MI 49307

Chris Velotta
NCR Corporation
Publication Services
Brown and Caldwell Sts., EMD-4
Dayton, OH 45479

James Zappen
Rensselaer Polytechnic Ins.
Dept. of Lang., Lit., & Comm.
Troy, NY 12180-3590

Appendix B

Annual Meetings, Sites, and Dates

1st	University of Minnesota	St. Paul, MN	1974
2nd	Boston University	Boston, MA	1975
3rd	Colorado State Univerwstiy	Fort Collins, CO	1976
4th	University of Minnesota	St. Paul, MN	1977
5th	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Troy, NY	1978
6th	Oklahoma State University	Stillwater, OK	1979
7th	University of Central Florida	Orlando, FL	1980
8th	University of Washington	Seattle, WA	1981
9th	Carnegie-Mellon University	Pittsburgh, PA	1982
10th	University of Nebraska	Lincoln, NE	1983
11th	La Fonda	Santa Fe, NM	1984
12th	Miami University	Oxford, OH	1985
13th	Clark Community College	Portland, OR Vancouver, WA	1986
14th	University of Central Florida	Orlando, FL	1987
15th	University of Minnesota	Minneapolis, MN	1988
16th	Rochester Institute of Technology	Rochester, NY	1989
17th	San Diego State University	San Diego, CA	1990
18th	University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati, OH	1991

Appendix C

1991 CPTSC Officers

President:	Sam Geonetta	University of Cincinnati
Vice President:	James P. Zappen	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Treasurer:	Laurie S. Hayes	University of Minnesota
Secretary:	Sherry Burgus Little	San Diego State University
Members at Large:	Mary Coney	University of Washington
	Daniel Riordan	University of Wisconsin-Stout
	Karen A. Schriver	Carnegie Mellon University

Appendix D

PAID CPTSC MEMBERS LIST

Unless otherwise noted, the first phone number given is the office number and the second number is the home number.

JO ALLEN
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
GREENVILLE, NC 27858
RT. 14, BOX 68B
GREENVILLE, NC 27834
919 757-6041
919 752-9549

PAUL V. ANDERSON
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
MIAMI UNIVERSITY
OXFORD, OH 45056
1316 DANA DRIVE
OXFORD, OH 45056

MARIAN G. BARCHILON
DEPT. OF INDUSTRIAL TECH.
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
TEMPE, AZ 85287
2153 EAST MINTON DRIVE
TEMPE, AZ 85282
602 965-8669
602 820-0464

STEPHEN BERNHARDT
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV
LAS CRUCES, NM 88003
4583 SANDLEWOOD DRIVE
LAS CRUCES, NM 88001
505 646-2027
505 521-4961

VIRGINIA BOOK
104 AG COMMUNICATIONS
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
LINCOLN, NE 68583
7300 OLD POST ROAD #4
LINCOLN, NE 68506
402 472-3034
402 488-4117

DEBORAH S. BOSLEY
UNIVERSITY OF NC AT CHARLOTTE
1111 SEWICKLEY DR.
CHARLOTTE, NC 28209
704 547-2708
704 523-1282
FEN00OSB@UNCCVM.BITNET

PAMELA ESTES BREWER
TERRA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
2830 NAPOLEON ROAD
FREMONT, OH 43420
256 WILLIAMS STREET
BOWLING GREEN, OH 43402
419 334-8400
419 352-0233

R. JOHN BROCKMANN
ENGLISH DEPT.
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
N ARK, DE 19716
R.D. 3, Box 5191
Milton, VT 05468

MARY FRAN BUEHLER
JEFFERSON LAB
CALIFORNIA INST. OF TECH.
PASADENA, CA 91109
410 CHURCHILL ROAD
SIERRA MADRE, CA 91024
818 355-5495
818 355-5495

LAURA CASARI
38 FOOD INDUSTRY COMPLEX
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
LINCOLN, NE 68583-0924
1436 C
LINCOLN, NE 68502

MARY CONEY
DEPT. OF TECH COMM
U OF WASHINGTON
14 LOEW HALL, FH-40
SEATTLE, WA 98195
1047 Belmont Pl. E.
Seattle, WA 98102
206 543-4557
206 324-6133

MARILYN M. COOPER
DEPT. OF HUMANITIES
MICHIGAN TECH. UNIV.
HOUGHTON, MI 49931
402 W. SOUTH AVENUE
HOUGHTON, MI 49931
906 487-2066
906 482-7834

ROBERT COSGROVE
SUNBELT CONSULTANTS
SADDLEBACK COLLEGE
MISSION VIEJO, CA 92692
31132 BROOKS STREET
SOUTH LAGUNA, CA 92677

DONALD CUNNINGHAM
9020 HALEY CENTER
DEPT OF ENGLISH
AUBURN UNIVERSITY
AUBURN, AL 36849
2114 HAMILTON PLACE NORTH
OPELIKA, AL 36801
205 844-9020
205 745-6059

LYNN DEMING
DEPT. OF HUMANITIES
NEW MEXICO TECH.
SOCORRO, NM 87801
1984 HWY 1
SAN ANTONIO, NM 87832
505 835-5123
505 835-4429

DAVID DYRUD
OREGON INST. OF TECH.
KLAMATH FALLS, OR 97601-8801
2027 LEROY
KLAMATH FALLS, OR 97601
503 882-6992
503 883-2365

SUSAN FEINBERG
HUMANITIES DEPT.
ILLINOIS INST. OF TECH.
CHICAGO, IL 60616
4007 RUTGERS LANE
NORTHBROOK, IL 60062
312 567-3465
708 564-8364

ANTHONY FLINN
EASTERN WASHINGTON U
511 EAST 19TH AVENUE
SPOKANE, WA 99203

ALEX FRIEDLANDER
DEPT. OF HUMANITIES
DREXEL UNIVERSITY
32ND & CHESTNUT ST.
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104
137 HENLEY ROAD
OVERBROOK HILLS, PA 19151
215 895-1711
215 649-3990

SAM GEONETTA
DEPT. OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
ML 103, 2220 VICTORY PKY
CINCINNATI, OH 45206
3318 MEADOW GREEN CT
AMELIA, OH 45102
513 556-6562
513 753-5449

PAT GOUBIL-GAMBRELL
239 DEPT. OF ENGLISH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
AMES, IA 50011
1019 ROOSEVELT AVE
AMES, IA 50010
515 294-2180
515 232-0040

JOHN HARRIS
3164 JKHB
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIV
PROVO, UT 84602
243 S 400 E
SPRINGVILLE, UT 84663
801 378-2387
801 489-4047

MARK HASELKORN
DEPT. OF TECH COMM
U OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WA 98195
2125 EAST INTERLAKEN
SEATTLE, WA 98112
206 543-2577
206 325-4468

LAURIE S. HAYES
DEPT. OF RHETORIC
202 HAECKER HALL
U OF MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL, MN 55108
2280 FOLWELL
FALCON HEIGHTS, MN 55108
612 624-7451
612 645-1355

JAMES M. HENRY
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
FAIRFAX, VA 22030-4444
1515 T STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

RENEE B. HOROWITZ
6257 E. CALLE CAMELIA
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

GLORIA JAFFE
ENGLISH DEPT.
UNIV. OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
ORLANDO, FL 32816
1910 ENGLEWOOD RD
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
407 823-2212
407 644-5057

ROBERT R. JOHNSON
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
MTSC PROGRAM
MIAMI UNIVERSITY
OXFORD, OH 45056
218 N CAMPUS AVENUE
OXFORD, OH 45056

DAN JONES
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
UNIV OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
ORLANDO, FL 32816
427 TIMBERWOOD TRAIL
OVIEDO, FL 32765
407 275-2212
407 365-2627

WILLIAM KARIS
DEPT OF TECH COMM
CLARKSON UNIVERSITY
BOX 5760
POTSDAM, NY 13899-5760
15 LEROY ST.
POTSDAM, NY 13676
315 268-6484
315 265-7113
KARIS@CLUTX.CLARKSON.EDU

JUDITH KAUFMAN
ENGLISH DEPT MS-25
EASTERN WA UNIVERSITY
CHENEY, WA 99004
WEST 2407 PACIFIC AVE
APARTMENT C
SPOKANE, WA 99204
509 359-2811
509 624 5737

PATRICK M. KELLEY
ANALYSTS INTERNATIONAL CORP.
SUITE 820 LB52
DALLAS, TX 75234
2225 BRANCHWOOD DRIVE
GRAPEVINE, TX 76051
214 243-2001

MARIA CURRO KREPPEL
UNIV OF CINCINNATI
105A ADMINISTRATION
CINCINNATI, OH 45221
3267 SOUTH WOODS LANE
CINCINNATI, OH 45213
513 556-4692
513 631-0616

TOM LANG
DEPT. OF SCI PUBLICATIONS
E4-07
CLEVELAND CLINIC FOUNDATION
ONE CLINIC CENTER DRIVE
CLEVELAND, OH 44195
13849 Edgewater Drive
Lakewood, OH 44107
916 895-5700
916 893-1690

MARY LAY
DEPT. OF RHETORIC
202 HAECKER
U OF MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL, MN 55108
887 MONTEREY
SHOREVIEW, MN 55126
612 624-2262
612 486-9699

CAROL LIPSON
WRITING PROGRAM
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
239 CROUSE HALL
SYRACUSE, NY 13244
100 ENFIELD PLACE
SYRACUSE, NY 13214
315 443-1083
315 446-3779

SHERRY BURGUS LITTLE
ENGLISH DEPT
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIV
SAN DIEGO, CA 92182
2482 VALLEY MILL ROAD
EL CAJON, CA 92020
619 594-5238 OR
619 594-5307
619 448-1219
SLITTLE@UCSVAX.SDSU.EDU

NANCY MACKENZIE
ENGLISH DEPT
MANKATO STATE UNIV
MANKATO, MN 56002
621 GRANT AVENUE
NORTH MANKATO, MN 56001
507 389-1166
507 387-1679

DENNIS MINOR
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
LOUISIANA TECH UNIV
RUSTON, LA 71272
1102 GLENWOOD
RUSTON, LA 71270
255-6045 (H)

MARGARET MORGAN
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE, NC
6512 TEANECK PL
CHARLOTTE, NC 28215
704-547-4211
704 567-8055
FEN00MPM.@UNCCUM.BITNET

CHARLES NELSON
ENGLISH DEPT.
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIV
YOUNGSTOWN, OH 44514
6707 SHAWBUTTE STREET
POLAND, OH 44514
216 742-1649
216 757-1764

NANCY O'ROURKE
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
LOGAN, UT 84322
P.O. BOX 3833
LOGAN, UT 84321
801 750-3647
801 753-7755

LESLIE OLSEN
TECH COMM PROGRAM
U OF MICHIGAN
111 TIDAL, 2360 BONISTEEL
ANN ARBOR, MI 48109
2114 Vinewood Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
313 764-1428 X7
313 995-5923
BITNET: USERGBED@UMICHUM
INTERNET: LESLIE_OLSEN@UB.CC.UMICH.EDU

W.S. PFEIFFER
HUMANITIES DEPT.
SOUTHERN COLLEGE OF TECH
1112 CLAY STREET
MARIETTA, GA 30064
423 N WOODLAND DR
MARIETTA, GA 30064
404 528-7202
404 424-1237

NELL ANN PICKETT
BOX 1266
HINDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RAYMOND, MS 39154
601 857-3361
601 857-5165

DIANA REEP
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
UNIV OF AKRON
AKRON, OH 44325
750 MULL #3A
AKRON, OH 44313
216 375-7470
216 864-6113

DANIEL RIORDAN
150B HARVEY HALL
UNIV OF WI-STOUT
MENOMONIE, WI 54751
1215 WILSON AVENUE
MENOMONIE, WI 54727
715 232-1344
715 235-7002
715 232-1629

CAROLYN RUDE
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
TEXAS TECH UNIV.
LUBBOCK, TX 79409-3091
3312 75TH STREET
LUBBOCK, TX 79423-1308
806 742-2517
806 793-3542
DITCR@TTACS

MARILYN S. SAMUELS
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
GUILFORD HOUSE
CASE WESTERN RESERVE
CLEVELAND, OH 44106
3068 WARRINGTON ROAD
SHAKER HEIGHTS, OH 44120
216 368-2340/2362
216 752-9334

ANN MARTIN SCOTT
ENGLISH DEPT.
DRAWER 44691-USL
UNIV OF SW LA
LAFAYETTE, LA 70504
P.O. BOX 186
CECILIA, LA 70521
318 231-5485
318 667-6414

JACK SELZER
ENGLISH DEPT.
PENN STATE UNIV
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA 16802
719 GLENN ROAD
STATE COLLEGE, PA 16803
814 865-0251
814 234-2935

HENRIETTA N. SHIRK
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
208 LIBERAL ARTS
BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
BOISE, ID 83725

BARBARA SMITH
BOX 2158
ALDERSON-BROADDUS COLLEGE
PHILIPPI, WV 26416
16 WILLIS LANE
PHILIPPI, WV 26416
304 457-1700 X301
304 457-3038

KATHERINE STAPLES
TECH COMM DEPT
AUSTIN COMM COLLEGE
RUTHERFORD CAMPUS
AUSTIN, TX 78714
508 PARK BLVD
AUSTIN, TX 78751
512 495-1678
512 467-8012

STEPHEN STEDMAN
TECH COMM PROGRAM
DEPT OF ENGLISH
TENNESSEE TECH UNIV
COOKEVILLE, TN 38505
ROUTE 8 BOX 338
COOKEVILLE, TN 38501
528-3820 (H)

GILBERT STORMS
DEPT OF ENGLISH
MIAMI UNIVERSITY
OXFORD, OH 45050
126 COUNTRY CLUB LANE
OXFORD, OH 45056
513 529-5262
513 523-5109

KRISTENE SUTLIFF
ENGLISH DEPT
SW MISSOURI STATE UNIV
901 SOUTH NATIONAL
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65804
1050 E. EDGEWOOD
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65807
417 836-5107
417 887-9020

CLAUDE TEWELES
ROXBURY PUBLISHING CO.
P.O. BOX 491044
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049
440 NORTH CROFT AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90048
213 653-1068 (O)

ELIZABETH TURPIN
DEPT OF LANG/LIT
FERRIS STATE UNIV
BIG RAPIDS, MI 49307
19418 GOLFVIEW DRIVE
BIG RAPIDS, MI 49307
616 592-3988
616 796-7672

BILLIE WAHLSTROM
RHETORIC DEPT
U OF MINNESOTA
202 HAECKER
ST. PAUL, MN 55108
703 LINCOLN
ST. PAUL, MN 55105
612 624-7750
612 292-0598

THOMAS WARREN
ENGLISH DEPT
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIV
STILLWATER, OK 74078
920 W. CANTWELL
STILLWATER, OK 74075
405 744-6218
405 624-3025

MERRILL WHITBURN
DEPT. OF LLC
RENSSELAER POLYTECH
TROY, NY 12180-3590
11 NORTH HILL ROAD
BALLSTON LAKE, NY 12019
518 276-6569
518 877-5310

KRISTIN WOOLEVER
COORD. OF TECH COMM.
ENGLISH DEPT
NORTHEASTERN UNIV
360 HUNTINGTON AVE
BOSTON, MA 02115
118 BEDFORD ST.
CONCORD, MA 01742

CAROLE YEE
HUMANITIES DEPT
NEW MEXICO TECH
SOCORRO, NM 87801
518 SCHOOL OF MINES
SOCORRO, NM 87801
505 835-5323
505 835-3765

ART YOUNG
DEPT. OF ENGLISH
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
CLEMSON, SC 29634-1503

JAMES ZAPPEN
DEPT OF LLC
RENSSELAER POLYTECH
TROY, NY 12180-3590
9 TAMARACK LANE
CLIFTON PARK, NY 12065
518 276-4871 FAX
518 383-3749 (H)
USEREUC2@RPITSMTS.BITNET

CORPORATE MEMBER:

MIKE BARTLETT
NCR CORPORATION
BROWN & CALDWELL STREETS
EMD-4
DAYTON, OH 45479

Appendix E

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COUNCIL FOR PROGRAMS IN TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION

As Amended
Rochester, New York
October, 1989
Page 1

****

ARTICLE I NAME: The name of the organization shall be the Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication.

ARTICLE II PURPOSES: The primary purposes of the organization shall be to (1) promote programs in technical and scientific communication, (2) promote research in technical and scientific communication, (3) develop opportunities for the exchange of ideas and information concerning programs, research, and career opportunities, (4) assist in the development and evaluation of new programs in technical and scientific communication, if requested, and (5) promote exchange of information between this organization and interested parties. Said organization is organized exclusively for educational purposes.

ARTICLE III MEMBERSHIP: Membership shall be open to any individual or institution interested in supporting the purposes identified in Article II. Individuals or institutions whose primary responsibilities or functions are education shall be designated Regular Voting Members. Others shall be designated non-voting Special Advisory Members. Membership shall be open to any person without regard for race, age, sex, or religious affiliation.

ARTICLE IV OFFICERS: The officers of the organization shall be president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, each to be elected for a two-year term. The duties of the officers shall be:

President:

(1) preside at the annual meeting or special meetings of the organization.

(2) represent the organization at official functions.
(3) serve as chairperson of the executive committee.
(4) designate others to perform duties.

Vice-President:

(1) perform all the duties of the president in the event of the president's absence.
(2) serve as managing editor of all publications.

Secretary:

(1) record official minutes of all meetings.
(2) maintain an up-to-date membership list and mailing lists.
(3) oversee correspondence.

Treasurer:

(1) handle all financial matters of the organization including the receiving and recording of dues and payment and paying the bills of the organization.
(2) transmit current membership information to the secretary on a regular basis.

The president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer, plus the immediate past president and three members-at-large, elected by the membership, shall serve as the executive committee. The executive committee shall have the right to act on behalf of the organization at such times as the organization is not meeting at the annual meeting or at special meetings, except to change the constitution or carry out elections.

ARTICLE V LIMITS: No part of the net earning of the organization shall inure to the benefit of, or be distributable to its members, trustees, officers, or other private persons, except that the organization shall be authorized and empowered to pay reasonable compensation for services rendered and to make payments and distributions in furtherance of the purposes set forth in Article II hereof. No substantial part of the activities of the organization shall be the carrying out of propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and the organization shall not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements) any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office. Notwithstanding any other provision of these articles, the organization shall not carry on any other activities not permitted to be carried on (a) by a corporation exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the corresponding provision of any future United States Internal Revenue Law) or (b) by a corporation, contributions to which are deductible under section 170(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or corresponding provision of any future United States Internal Revenue Law).

ARTICLE VI
MEETINGS:

The organization shall convene an annual meeting. The location and approximate date of the annual meetings shall be determined by vote of members present and voting at an annual meeting. Special meetings of the organization may be held as needed and determined by the executive committee.

ARTICLE VII
FINANCES:

The dues of the organization shall be $20 per year for Regular Voting Members and $100 per year for non-voting Special Advisory Members. Memberships shall be based on a calendar year, and dues shall be payable in January.

ARTICLE VIII
ELECTIONS:

(1) The election of officers and members-at-large to the executive committee shall be by written mail-in ballot. The ballot will have a list of candidates who are members presented by the nominating committee, and all nominations will have secured permission.

There will be more than one candidate, as well as provision for writing in at least one additional nominee for each position open.

(2) The Immediate Past President shall chair the nominating committee and shall appoint, in consultation with the executive committee, four additional members: one from the executive committee and three from general membership, and shall announce committee membership at the annual meeting preceding elections.

(3) The nominating committee will have a slate of officers and members-at-large mailed to the membership no later than 60 days prior to the annual meeting. Ballots must be returned no later than 15 days before the start of the annual meeting.

(4) Results of the election will be announced at the business meeting of the annual meeting.

ARTICLE IX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS: Proposed amendments to the constitution must be in the hands of the members at least 60 days in advance of the annual business meeting at which the vote is to be taken. The constitution shall be amendable by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting and ballots mailed in to the secretary or proxy ballots from members unable to attend the annual business meeting accepted up to the opening of the annual business meeting.

ARTICLE X DISSOLUTION: Upon the dissolution of the organization, the executive committee shall, after paying or making provision for the payment of all of the liabilities of the organization, dispose of all of the assets of the organization exclusively for the purposes of the organization in such manner, or to such organization or organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable, educational, religious, or scientific purpose as shall at the time qualify as an exempt organization or organizations under section 501(c)(3) of the

Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the corresponding provision of any future United States Internal Revenue Law), as the executive committee shall determine. Any such assets not disposed of shall be disposed of by the Court of Common Pleas of the county in which the principal office of the corporation is then located, exclusively for such purposes or to such organization or organizations, as said Court shall determine, which are organized and operated exclusively for such purposes.

ARTICLE XI PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY: All official meetings, of the organization, shall be conducted according to the most current edition of the Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure by Alice B. Sturgis. The presiding officer shall appoint a parliamentarian to advise the assembly at each annual meeting.

Appendix F

Program Review Board Planning Committee: Draft Documents*

COUNCIL FOR PROGRAMS IN TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION
(CPTSC)

APPLICATION FOR CPTSC PROGRAM REVIEW

and

GUIDELINES FOR SELF-STUDY TO PRECEDE CPTSC VISIT

October 1991

*For discussion only, not for use in program review.

COUNCIL FOR PROGRAMS IN TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION (CPTSC)

APPLICATION FOR CPTSC PROGRAM REVIEW

General Information:

1. Name of institution: ______________________________

2. Address of institution: ______________________________

____

Telephone: ________________

3. Name of the department: ______________________________

4. Name of person completing this profile: ____________________
Title: ______________________________

5 Public: ____________ Private: ____________

6. Two-year college: ____ Four-year college: ____ University.____

7. Undergraduate programs:
_____ AA
_____ BS
_____ BA
_____ Certificate
_____ Minor
_____ Other: ______________

8. Graduate programs:
_____ MS
_____ MA
_____ Ph.D.
_____ Other: ______________

9. Student enrollment in each of your programs:
_____ AA
_____ BS
_____ BA
_____ Certificate
_____ Minor
_____ MS
_____ MA
_____ Ph.D.
_____ Other: ______________

10. Why are you seeking an outside evaluation?
_____ State legislative mandate
_____ Board of Trustees' (Regents') mandate
_____ College president's or dean's request
_____ Department chair's request
_____ Request of department members
_____ Other (please explain): ______________________________

11a. How do you define your program?
_____ Technical writing program.
_____ Technical communication program.
_____ Other: ______________________________

11b. What does the above program nomenclature mean for you practically and philosophically?

Course Offerings: *[Indicate those which are required courses.]*

12. Courses offered in your undergraduate programs:
(Please attach an additional sheet, if necessary.)

Course Number & Title: *Frequency of Offering:* *No./Size of Sections:*

13. Courses offered in your graduate programs:
(Please attach an additional sheet, if necessary.)

Course Number & Title: *Frequency of Offering:* *No./Size of Sections:*

____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____

14. What percentage of your program courses are taught by each of the following groups?
_____ Full-time tenured faculty
_____ Full-time non-tenured
_____ Full-time pre-tenured faculty
_____ Part-time faculty
_____ Teaching assistants

15a. Do you offer any courses that introduce students to the discipline of Scientific and Technical Communication? _____ Yes _____ No

15b. If so, please list them:
____
____
____
____
____
____
____

16a. Do you have any laboratories associated with your Scientific and Technical Communication programs -- photography, video, print lab, computers, graphics, etc.? _____ Yes _____ No

16b. If so, what are they? ______________________________

16c. If so, who supervises them? ______________________________

16d. If so, how many students are served by the labs? ______________

16e. If so, how many faculty are involved in them? ______________

Faculty:

17. How many faculty teach in your programs? ______________

18. How many of these faculty are:
    _____ Tenured faculty
    _____ Pre-tenured faculty
    _____ Part-time faculty

19. In what areas have your program faculty received their terminal degrees?

20. In what areas are your program faculty conducting research/ scholarship?

____
____
____
____
____
____
____

21. How many faculty have industry experience? ____________________
_____ Years of full-time industry experience for each
_____ Years of part-time consulting for each
In what areas of the profession? ______________________________
____
____
____
____
____

22a. What is the typical course load per term for a teacher in your programs? ____

22b. Please explain, if this course load differs for full-time versus part-time faculty:
Full-time faculty: _______________________________________
Part-time faculty: _______________________________________

Administration and Governance:

23. Who directly supervises your programs? ____________________

24. Name and title of person indicated in question above:
____

25a. Is there a committee which is advisory to the program supervisor?
_____ Yes _____ No

25b. If so, how is membership on the committee determined? ____________

25c. If so, on what matters do they advise? ____________

Summation:

26. What major concerns would you like to have the CPTSC program review committee address? ____________

27. What special conditions about your campus and its programs should CPTSC consider in reviewing your programs? ____________

28. Preferred times for evaluation visit (indicate a first and second preference):
    Fall (September, October, November)
    Winter (December, January, February)
    Spring (March, April, May)
    Summer (June, July, August)

29. Name, title, department, mailing address, and telephone number of person applying for CPTSC consultants. All correspondence will be directed to this person unless we are instructed otherwise.

Name: ____

Title: ____

Department: ____________________________________

Address: ______________________________________

____

Telephone: _____________________________________

30. We are interested in a preliminary consultation visit to assist us with our self-study.

_____ Yes _____ No

PLEASE DIRECT ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS APPLICATION AND THE ACCOMPANYING SELF-STUDY MATERIALS TO THE FOLLOWING CPTSC REPRESENTATIVE:

Name: ____

Title: ____

Department: ____________________________________

Address: ______________________________________

____

Telephone: _____________________________________

GUIDELINES FOR SELF-STUDY TO PRECEDE CPTSC VISIT

At least one month before the CPTSC program review team consultants are scheduled to visit your campus, you should prepare a self-study document to acquaint the consultants with your institution. The self-study is basically a narrative which addresses the following concerns.

I. Focus of the Evaluation Visit

   A. What are the program's current concerns?

   B. What changes (if any) is the program planning to implement?

II. Curriculum

   A. Courses and Goals

      1. What Scientific and Technical Communication courses are currently taught in your department? How are they related? Indicate which courses are required, and which ones require prerequisites.

      2. What courses supporting Scientific and Technical Communication are offered by areas outside your department? Indicate which courses are required and which ones have prerequisites.

      3. What are the goals of the program?

      4. What goals do the administration and faculty in other departments think the program should have?

      5. What are the program entrance requirements?

   B. Syllabus

      1. Does each Scientific and Technical Communication course have a standard syllabus?

2. Is there a logical sequence of courses and of course units or assignments for each course?

3. Are there opportunities for faculty to share and develop syllabi? What control does the Scientific and Technical Communication program administrator have over syllabi and their development?

4. What opportunities exist for experimentation?

5. How is class time apportioned per day, per week, per term?

6. How much writing, and what kind of writing, must students do for each course?

7. What labs, if any, are students required to take as part of their major?

8. Are there courses in the program in speaking and oral presentation? Is an oral component part of any other classes required for the major?

9. Are there any courses in the program specifically devloted to reading skills?

10. Are there any courses in the program dealing with research methodology?

11. Are there any courses in the program dealing with the pedagogy of Scientific and Technical Communication?

C. Instructional Methods and Materials

1. What methods are used to deal with student writing in the program's writing courses? Are these methods consistent with the program's goals?

2. What kinds of classroom activities are most common?

3. Do the writing courses use textbooks? How many and what kind (handbooks, rhetorics, anthologies, workbooks, dictionaries, etc.)? Which books are used in which courses?

4. Who makes decisions about texts? What options are available for faculty and for teaching assistants or adjunct faculty?

5. Why is the program using the textbooks it is currently using?

6. What instructional materials and media does the program use other than textbooks?

7. Does the program use student writing as instructional material? Are there reproduction facilities readily available to duplicate student work for classes?

8. Do writing teachers have adequate office space for conferring with students?

9. Do teachers in the program require use of the computer for any courses? What computer facilities are available for faculty and to students? What fee structure or other course requirements are used to control access to computing? What kinds of computer applications are used or available?

D. Testing

1. What tests and testing procedures does the program currently use for placement and exemption? Why are these particular tests used? Have they been validated for the population of studentsthey are administered to at this institution?

2. How are placement decisions made and carried out? Does the program evaluate proficiency? If so, how?

3. How are the tests administered? Who administers them? Who scores them? How are those who administer and score tests compensated? What kind of and how much compensation do they get?

4. What is the program's policy on transfer students?

E. Grading Practices

1. What is the institutions grading system? How does the program's grading system relate to the institution's grading system?

2. How are grades determined in individual courses? Are there agreed-upon criteria? If so, how are these criteria enforced? If not,how does the program arrive at uniformity in grading?

3. How do students perceive the program's grading system? What has been done to find out?

F. Internships

1. Does your program have an internship option for students?

2. Are internships supervised? Who is responsible for supervision?

3. Where, typically, have students been placed for internships?

III. Program Administration

A. Institutional and Program Structure

1. What is the size and makeup of the department or administrative unit in which the Scientific and Technical Communication program is housed? What is the governing structure of that department or unit? What percentage of full-time faculty at each rank, adjunct faculty, and graduate students teach in the program?

2. How many writing courses do faculty at each rank or status teach?

3. Wht is the internal governing structure of the Scientific and Technical Communication program? Is there a Scientific and Technical Communication program administrator ("director of technical communication," "scientific and technical communication committee chair," etc.?) If so, what is this person's administrative relation to other levels of administration? To whom is this person responsible?

4. How is the Scientific and Technical Communication program related through administration and curriculum to other departments and divisions in the institution?

5. If there are night school or nondegree programs, what control does this administrator have over the way the Scientific and Technical Communication courses are taught in those programs? How does the administrator exercise that control? What responsibility does the administrator have for the teaching of technical communication (e.g., "Technical Writing for Engineers") in other departments or colleges within the institution?

6. Where do the funds that support the Scientific and Technical program come from? Who administers that money? What is it spent on?

7. Who hires, promotes, tenures, salaries, and assigns courses to Scientific and Technical Communication staff?

8. How are new teaching positions in the Scientific and Technical Communication program determined, and by whom?

9. Who determines class size, curriculum, and teaching load?

10. How are the programs internal problems solved? Who decides on syllabi, testing procedures, textbooks, curriculum, etc.? What voice do full-time faculty, part-time faculty, teaching assistants, and students have in shaping scientific and technical program policies? What permanent or *ad hoc* committees relevant to the Scientific and Technical Communication program exist? How are these committees appointed? What do they do?

11. What arre the procedures for negotiating complaints about grading, teaching, and administrative processes and policies?

B. Scientific and Technical Communication Administrator's Job Description

1. How is the Scientific and Technical Communication administrator chosen?

2. What is the current administrator's academic and professional background?

3. What is the current administrator's rank and tenure status? Is the director tenured? If not, why not?

4. What is his or her teaching load?

5. What is he or she responsible for?

6. To whom is he or she responsible?

7. How long does the director hold the job? Is there a specified term of appointment? What provisions are made for reviewing the quality of the director's work and the quality of his or her contributions to the Scientific and Technical Communication program and institution as a whole?

8. What rewards are there for doing high-quality work as a director? Who grants these awards?

IV. Faculty Development

A. Current Conditions

1. How many full-time and part-time people teach program courses?

2. What training and experience do these teachers have? What professional organizations do they belong to? What is their record of research, publication, and conference participation?

3. How are high-quality teaching and research rewarded, especially in terms of salary increase, promotion, and tenure?

4. What courses, speaker programs, workshops, awards and support series does the program offer or support to encourage excellence in teaching scientific and technical communication? What opportunities for faculty development already exist? Who uses them? How do faculty find

out about them? In what ways are faculty encouraged to avail themselves of these opportunities?

5. What kinds of work and activities occur during department or program staff meetings? How frequently are these meetings held? Who attends them?

B. Support for Faculty Development

1. How is "faculty development" defined as a goal of the institution, the department or administrative unit, and the Scientific and Technical Communication program?
2. What financial resources are available for workshops, speakers, travel to conferences, developing research, and evaluating new Scientific and Technical Communication courses and new teaching techniques?
3. What is the faculty attitude toward faculty development? What is the faculty attitude toward training that is designed to improve the teaching of Scientific and Technical Communication? What is the attitude of composition teachers, speech teachers, humanities teachers, and literature teachers toward Scientific and Technical Communication teachers? What is the attitude of faculty in one area of the scientific and technical communication program (e.g., speech, graphics, rhetorical theory, etc.)?
4. How are faculty encouraged to develop their skills in Scientific and Technical Communication research and teaching? What opportunities exist for learning about faculty development programs in effect at other institutions?

IV. Support Services

[Definition: A support service is a facility which provides learning resources to expand and enhance classroom instruction. Examples may include such services as libraries and computer labs.]

A. Definition

1. What services exist at the institution? What specific kinds of help do these services offer to students and faculty? What kinds of materials and techniques does each support service use? Does the service use a variety of materials and techniques, or does it focus mainly on one type?

2. What are the goals and instructional plans of each service? Do any services offered by the Scientific and Technical Communication program and the support services overlap? Do their common goals and procedures reinforce each other or conflict?

3. In what institutional ways (through scheduling, a coordinating committee, handbook exchange, etc.) is each support service coordinated with the Scientific and Technical Communication program?

4. Do all the faculty in the Scientific and Technical communication program and elsewhere in the institution know that all these services exist? What is the faculty attitude toward these services? Do they send their students to them, or use them themselves?

5. Who uses each support services? How many students and which faculty? What is the profile of students who use each service?

6. How is information about each service spread to students and faculty?

7. How are students placed in or referred to each support service?

8. What evidence is there that each service meets the goals it sets for itself or that the institution has set for it?

C. Personnel

1. What are the qualifications for working in each support service? How are the director and staff selected for each? What is the institutional status (faculty, graduate student, full-time, part-time, etc.) of support service personnel? How are they compensated for their work? How is their work evaluated?

2. How are support service personnel trained?

3. What evidence is there of professional development among support service personnel?

4. What opportunities are there for professional development of support service personnel? How does the institution reward support service personnel for improving the service and for developing themselves professionally?

5. What kind of relationship exists between the Scientific and Technical Communication program faculty and support service personnel? How do support service personnel view the Scientific and Technical Communication faculty, and vice versa? Do writing program faculty and support service personnel meet regularly to discuss students involved in both programs? Is there an active exchange of of information on curricular and administrative matters?

6. What role do support service personnel play in formulating Scientific and Technical Communication program policy? What role to Scientific and Technical communication program faculty play in formulating the policies and procedures of support services?

D. Administration

1. Do students get credit for work completed in support services? If so, how is credit determined?

2. How is each support service funded? Who decides how the money is spent? How is it currently being spent?

3. Does each support service keep records of expenditures, contact hours, enrollment, student work completed, services rendered, credit cards, etc.?

4. Does each support service follow-up on students who have used its services?

5. Is their continuing self-evaluation of each service by its staff? Is each service regularly evaluated by someone not actively involved in its work?

6. What coordination exists between the support services, the Scientific and Technical Communication program, and the institution's admissions and recruitment officers?

7. What are the short-term and long-range goals of each support service? How does each plan to reach these goals?

You do not want to overwhelm consultants with background materials, but you will want to include the following in an appendix to the narrative report:

1. Statistical information for the previous and current academic year: enrollments, class sizes, composition of the teaching staff, final grade distribution.

2. A description of each course within the program(s) to be evaluated (objectives, syllabi, texts, placement and exemption procedures, grading criteria).

3. Tallies of evaluations completed by students and peers.

4. Materials pertaining to teacher training (both faculty and graduate students or adjuncts), including orientation meeting agendas, workshop descriptions, and syllabi for training courses.

5. Curriculum vitae and position description of program director(s).